THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke*

No. 3 | March 1959 | New Series Vol. II

RECTOR AND MASTER:

Mark Pattison and Benjamin Jowett[1]

By Basil Willey, F.B.A., King Edward VII Professor of English Literature, Cambridge

It is remarkable, and very fortunate, that these two books should have appeared, as they did last year, almost simultaneously. For they deal with two of the most eminent Heads of Houses in nineteenth-century Oxford —men who were not only outstanding and influential in their time but whose lives and histories were in some ways strangely parallel. Both contributed to *Essays and Reviews* (1860): Pattison, the essay 'Tendencies of Religious Thought, 1688—1750', and Jowett that 'On the Interpretation of Scripture', generally accounted the two best (though not the most notorious) essays in the volume. Both were leaders of that school of liberalizing theologians whose influence was increasingly felt as the Tractarian tide receded. In his essay, Pattison adopted the technique, more fully exploited by Leslie Stephen, of obliquely criticizing the religious ideas of his own age by analyzing those of the preceding century; indeed he could, and quite possibly would, have written a major work on eighteenth-century thought had Stephen not forestalled and discouraged him. Jowett, on the other hand, was concerned to show why and in what sense the Bible must be read 'like any other book'—a proposition then regarded as subversive but now, like most of the 'heresies' in *Essays and Reviews*, taken for granted by all Christians except the most extreme Fundamentalists. Both men incurred odium and suspicion for these contributions, and

[1] *Oxford Common Room: A Study of Lincoln College and Mark Pattison*, by V. H. H. Green (Edward Arnold, 1957); *Jowett: A Portrait with Background*, by Geoffrey Faber (Faber & Faber, 1957).

both (this is the point at which their careers touch most closely) missed election to the headship of their respective colleges at the moment when they first expected it. Pattison was passed over for the Rectorship of Lincoln in 1851; Jowett for the Mastership of Balliol in 1854. Pattison had to wait ten years, and Jowett sixteen, before the reward came; both then enjoyed a reign of twenty-three years—if 'enjoyed' be the right word—Pattison from 1861 till his death in 1884, and Jowett from 1870 till his death in 1893. Both were bitterly disappointed by their set-backs, and cut themselves off from their colleagues in what can only be described as a prolonged fit of sulks. But here the profound difference between the two men begins to appear; Jowett duly recovered his inward poise and continued with unabated zeal that work as Balliol Tutor which made him the leading educational force of his time; whereas Pattison sank ever deeper into a morass of self-pity and bitter melancholy from which he never wholly emerged.

Pattison, it must be confessed, was a loveless and disagreeable man, and his moroseness and self-centredness provide a very unedifying spectacle for those of us who welcome, wherever we can find it, the co-existence of 'advanced' views with the graces of the Christian character. It is indeed difficult to see in what sense (other than that of being an ordained priest) Pattison can be called a 'Christian' at all. His ultimate belief may have been a kind of philosophic theism, but of Christian faith, hope and charity—not to mention humility, forgiveness and self-forgetfulness—he shows hardly a trace. Nevertheless, his intellectual power and the passionate intensity of his inner life raise him head and shoulders above all the other Lincoln College characters described by Canon Green, and almost make him a genuinely tragic figure. It is for this reason that readers of *Oxford Common Room* will find their interest aroused chiefly by the chapters that narrate his story and analyze his character. This is not to say that the other chapters are not valuable; the author his admirably fulfilled his intention of writing a piece of college history which should also be a history of Oxford during its crisis of reform and modernization. But the interest of much that he tells us about Lincoln College affairs and persons, though considerable, is relatively parochial until the entry of Mark Pattison. Then the sap begins to flow freely, and the narrative becomes enthralling.

Pattison's story reminds one of the career of Markham Sutherland in J. A. Froude's early novel, *The Nemesis of Faith*; like him, he suffered nemesis for having attached himself, in youth, to beliefs which later proved impossible. For Pattison, like Froude and unlike Jowett, had in early life been strongly influenced by Newman; he had contributed to the Lives of the British Saints; and had kept a diary in which he reproved himself constantly for failures in saintliness, and sometimes criticized the backslidings of others (as when he expressed disgust at the Rev. John Hannah

for ordering mutton chops at 4 on a Friday). His Tractarianism, however, was mainly an affair of longing for Newman's good opinion; having no real root, it soon withered, and his soul was left all the drier for this early forcing.

Sir Geoffrey Faber's canvas is much larger. He views his subject, not from the Common Room standpoint, but from the vantage-ground of a practised historian of ideas and movements. Thus his book, while planned as a biography of Jowett, and while eminently successful as such, includes in its sweep the whole panorama of the later Victorian Age. We learn from him all we ever need know about *Essays and Reviews* and its authors; about Bishop Colenso; about University reform — educational and administrative; and about the troops of friends who, while Pattison grew lonelier and surlier, gathered round the 'old man honourable' in ever-growing multitudes. Thus, while *Oxford Common Room* begins as a college history and becomes a biography as by necessary accident, *Jowett* is a biography from start to finish, but inevitably becomes as all-inclusive as the mind and interests of its subject.

Both Canon Green and Sir Geoffrey Faber have made use of important unpublished materials: the former, of the Pattison MSS. in the Bodleian Library; and the latter, of the Jowett Papers lent to him by Balliol College. Readers of the two books under review have therefore before them more information about Pattison and Jowett than has hitherto been available, and indeed as much as is now likely to come to light. Pattison's *Memoirs* and Campbell and Abbott's official *Life and Letters of Jowett* are not superseded, but they are now supplemented by certain vital clues, which lead us nearer than before to the heart of both men's mystery. The clue to Pattison, for example, lies in Hauxwell Rectory, and especially in the character and influence of his father, the Rev. Mark James Pattison. The elder Pattison was a man of violent temper, whose passions and suspicions (and, for a time, actual insanity) turned the rectory into a prison for his wife and daughters, and maintained there an atmosphere of fear and constraint suggestive of *Wuthering Heights*. Mark Pattison escaped from the horror of this home-background, but he bore its lifelong scars in the form of an unconquerable inferiority-feeling accompanied (as so often) by a compensatory pride and ambition, and an aggressive desire to excel and prevail. He probably also inherited from his father the constitutional melancholy and the self-pity which dogged him throughout life, and hampered the development of his great talents.

The clue to Jowett too, as Sir Geoffrey Faber amply shows, lies in the Jowett family history, and especially in his father's failure to make a worldly success (or any kind of success) of his life. The family was scattered, and the boy Benjamin was alone for years, cut off from the normal supports of home-life. He, too, was thrown on his own resources, and knew that he must be a self-made man or nothing. Moreover, he had

certain physical peculiarities—a pretty, girlish appearance and a piping voice in particular—which produced a painful shyness that he only fully conquered, if at all, late in life. But if both Pattison and Jowett scored their successes, as it were, on the rebound from unhappy beginnings, Jowett's achievement was by far the greater. He resolved his inner discords, and attained a wholeness of character, a harmony of heart and intellect, which was denied Pattison; and he achieved this not by any self-regarding quest for perfection, but by love of the brethren. Jowett lost his life for Balliol's sake, and found it in the love and loyalty of the many pupils for whom he lived; Pattison, treating Lincoln as a means of self-aggrandizement, lost most of what makes life worth living. One thing only Jowett lacked—and he sorrowfully confessed that it left his life incomplete—the fulfilment of marriage. Even in this, however, he was more blessed than Pattison, whose marriage at the age of 48 to a beautiful girl of 21 was as disastrous as that of Casaubon to Dorothea Brooke in *Middlemarch*, and for similar reasons. (How far did George Eliot, who knew both of them well, use their situation as material for her novel? On this vexed question Canon Green is judiciously non-committal; he admits the full force of the evidence against it, yet concludes that 'the suspicion cannot be entirely eliminated that the marriage between the ageing scholar and the young girl, not entirely without friction at the time that *Middlemarch* was being written, may have been in George Eliot's mind, though the elaboration of the development and psychological insight into their relationship was prophetic rather than historical.')

Both these books show us modern Oxford struggling to free itself from its ancient shackles of clerical and aristocratic exclusiveness and intellectual stagnation, and both Pattison and Jowett were active University reformers. Yet their notions of what a great University should be and do were widely divergent, and their respective ideals accurately reflected the characters of the two men. Pattison, the loveless intellectual, for whom study was the only escape from life, thought that a University existed for the promotion of research and the advancement of learning. Jowett, the adored Tutor for whom his pupils were all in all, thought it existed in order to teach undergraduates and form their characters. Pattison despised Jowett for trying to turn Oxford into a 'super-public-school'.

The essence of Jowett't greatness lay in his religion. From the point of view of Victorian orthodoxy he may have been what Coleridge called a 'minimifidian', believing little; but that little he believed intensely. Like Matthew Arnold and like all true modern churchmen, he saw that men could not do without Christianity, but could not do with it as it was. His lifelong effort therefore was to make religion invulnerable to criticism, not by fighting the time-spirit or making forced concessions to it, but by grounding faith on a firm basis of truth and Christian discipleship. It boded ill for Christianity, he thought, when the main effort of its

official representatives was not to make men followers of Christ, but to shut the eyes of their minds to all new truth. Christianity must welcome truth from every quarter, or else perish. Perhaps Jowett ought to have 'spoken out' more freely; as Sir Geoffrey says, 'If Jowett could have had a touch of Colenso's rashness added to his caution, there would be no need to argue whether he was, or was not, a great man.' In fact, after his essay 'On the Interpretation of Scripture' and his Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles, he virtually retired from the theological field, and found in Plato 'what was to be a lifelong escape from the exposition of his theological ideas—from the task to which he had once longed to dedicate himself'. His biographer puts up a brave defence: 'What was the use,' he says, interpreting Jowett's thoughts, 'of writing for a hostile, ignorant, powerfully prejudiced clerical public? The reception of his two outspoken essays, *On Atonement and Satisfaction* and *On the Interpretation of Scripture*, had forced him to realize that most of what he thought was not only anathema to the great majority of clergymen, but would be repudiated even by such men as Tait or Temple. The bitterness of being rejected by his own college, the prosecutions of Wilson and Williams, the attempt to put him on trial before the Vice-Chancellor, the fate of Colenso . . . —all this, on top of the humiliation and injustice meted out to him as a hard-working professor, had taught him to hold his tongue. . . . There were other and more effective ways of using his abilities.' There were indeed; generations of Balliol men, many of them shapers of England's destiny, knew from his teaching and example that he stood for faith in God, salvation through righteousness, and righteousness through Christ. Jowett was one of the foremost of those Victorian liberals who have helped to restore buoyancy and flexibility to Christianity by forcing it to abandon some of its most untenable defences. And as Dr. Alec Vidler has recently said, 'many who now take advantage of this flexibility omit to acknowledge, or perhaps are unaware of, their debt to those who won it for them'.

MODERN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

By J. S. Bezzant, Dean of St. John's College, Cambridge

At the present time there is an increasing literature in which philosophers whose basic concern is the analysis and use of language are treating theology more seriously than contemporary fashionable theologians are taking them. 'Biblical theology' is engaged in erecting elaborate superstructures with a confidence that sandy foundations do not justify and paying little attention to the fact that even these are being undermined. No 'Biblical theology' is possible without great selectiveness from the immensely varied materials contained in the Bible, and the bases of the selection are determined by principles which are either arbitrary or else are by no means only or wholly derived from Scripture. There is a widespread attitude, seldom established otherwise than by sheer assertion, that theological beliefs can be grounded and defended without attention to criticisms based on knowledge and philosophy; these are simply swept aside because they are unbiblical or untheological.[1] This attitude is not surprising in an age of competing dogmatisms or vague scepticism, except in the sciences; but its continuance is as perilous to theology as it is unworthy of the name.

These questions have been admirably treated by Dr. Hepburn in a recent book[2]—more accurately described by its sub-title—in which he writes that

> 'no theology can ultimately escape those questions of meaning and verification with which we have been concerned—even those theologies which set their faces against natural religion, arguments for God's existence, or apologetics *in toto*. In so far as they use words at all, questions about the *use* of those words can and must be asked. . . . We have repeatedly seen how much need there is for this sort of logical spring-cleaning within theology at the present time.'

Much contemporary theology is but increasing the dust; and the importance of this book is that its author so clearly and so largely justifies his conclusion.

Apart from his merits of clarity, incisiveness and an eye for what is basic, Dr. Hepburn confesses, with an obvious sincerity, his own continuing personal pilgrimage in search of a satisfactory justification of religious belief. He examines various attempts to provide it, finds that none of them can survive scrutiny and, rightly, cannot accept any which involve sacrifice of intellectual integrity. Barth, Brunner, Buber, Farmer, Gogarten, Niebuhr, Alan Richardson and others receive acute attention.

[1]Biblical exegesis is not Theology. It is the sifting of material for a systematic theology, which should be concerned with shewing Biblical material as defensible in relation to other knowledge; unless, of course, *grounds* are given on which Biblical statements can override all other knowledge.

[2]*Christianity and Paradox*. Critical Studies in Twentieth Century Theology. By Ronald W. Hepburn. (C. A. Watts & Co., Ltd. Pp. 209. Price 18*s*. net.)

I think that his criticisms are in the main successful (with some reservations in respect of Farmer); and other theologians who are influenced by these writers should attend to Dr. Hepburn's criticisms.

Particularly valuable are his chapters on 'Encounters', i.e. what may be called 'the *I—Thou*' theology, which stems from Buber. The criticisms are condensed and a summary would mislead. For myself, I should say that whether or not there is a direct *unmediated* encounter between God and man, if God is a determinate living Spirit in any sense personal, the *I—Thou* language is the only correct way of talking about his relations with man; to use language which suggests (though I do not think any intelligent Christian ever *intends* this) that God is an object, like an *'It'*, is a degradation of the Divine. *But is there any such direct unmediated encounter?* None can doubt the existence of an object of direct immediate experience: the reality of God many people unfortunately find it only too easy to doubt. A person may have been a lifelong Christian, regularly practising the relevant religious devotions; but all too often his life can be a struggle to believe with integrity the more important theological statements. I am very willing to regard this, in myself, as due to defects of natural endowment increased by moral failures, and I should be even more willing so to regard it if I did not find it to be also true of many whose endowments and spiritual life are highly superior to mine. For example, Newman was vividly aware of the two 'self-luminous realities'—God and his own soul; but he adds that his reason for believing in God was his own moral consciousness. Now a belief, even amounting to assured conviction, for which that kind of reason is given, is not *immediate*, the result of an unmediated Divine-human 'encounter'. The 'encounter theology' seems to me to be open, and in a more acute form, to all the objections brought against the claim that there is a *sui generis* 'religious experience', independent of other knowledge and otherwise grounded experiences and beliefs, which can be treated as an assured foundation for theology. One cannot refute another who claims to have experienced such a direct encounter, but one can do much to support the strongest doubt whether the experience is in fact independent or unmediated, while the claimant is powerless to convince others who have no such experience.

The sections of this book dealing with the importance and place of reliable history in Christian origins should be carefully weighed by those who talk as though the essential Christian doctrine of the Incarnation can reasonably survive radical historical scepticism. Of all serious attempts to 'undergird the ship' this is the most futile. It is not that reliable history, even if we had more of it, could ever *prove* the doctrine: the point is that without reliable information about Jesus the doctrine does not seriously arise. An explanation of alleged facts cannot survive the disappearance of the facts it explains; nor can a doctrine reasonably be accepted

solely on the testimony of others who were manifestly influenced in forming it by arguments which would have little or no weight with educated people to-day. In my judgment Dr. Hepburn is entirely sound in his reasoning which leads to his conclusion that what is broadly known as 'existential history' cannot bear the weight laid upon it by many theologians. Again, I think that what he writes about ethics and moral seriousness unsupported by religious beliefs is very relevant for those who talk and write (flying in face of manifest facts) as though no high moral standards can be maintained except on the basis of religion. But here, I think, he under-estimates the deep and interlacing relations of these two distinguishable but by no means wholly separate activities of the spirit of man; for, on the one hand, no criticisms of religious beliefs are so deadly as those sustainable on moral grounds while, on the other hand, history and experience show that morality suffers a severe constriction if temporal acts have no abiding and eternal issues, which seems to me more weighty than dubious theory that there is no reason why it should be so.

Less significant are the pages on 'God and Cosmos'. So long as Roman Catholic and other theologians attempt to maintain that the classical 'proofs' of the existence of God are valid, it is legitimate and good that others should show that they are not. But nearly all that Dr. Hepburn has to say about them has been repeated often in articles and books of other language-philosophers; and in fact most English theologians who attend to these classical arguments in their modern forms make no claim that they afford coercive proof, regard the ontological argument as fallacious apart from the sharpening of criticisms of it which language-philosophy supplies, and estimate the others as having varying degrees of value as supplying some basis for faith. Dr. Hepburn acknowledges 'a genuine suspension of judgment' about one of them.

In his final chapter the author, avoiding general conclusions about the present state of theology based upon his admittedly selective studies, writes that

> 'enough may have been done to suggest that there is at least the *danger* that a breakdown in theology is taking place, despite the immense amount of self-assured talk of a contemporary "theological renaissance".'

He then asks, assuming that the breakdown *had* taken place, whether a Christian could continue to hold his faith with intellectual honesty? He believes this possible, but only by 'very daring (some will say wild) manoeuvres'. I hope I do not misrepresent him if I find the core of his answer to his question in his words:

> 'Our religiously-minded sceptic can be seen as perpetually in quest of the most satisfactory set of parables to sum up his moral decisions.'

This Dr. Hepburn expands and illustrates. It has clear resemblances to Professor Braithwaite's well-known lecture and acknowledges indebtedness to A. Macintyre's essay in *Metaphysical Beliefs*.

I do not find the answer at all satisfactory. I do not think a satisfactory answer can be given. Why on earth should anyone with enough intelligence to read and profit by this book, let alone to write it, desire a set of parables to sum up moral decisions he has already made?—unless, indeed, he feels that those decisions are like some modern beer which is said to be so much weaker than water as to be considerably strengthened by adding water to it. For parables which are *only parables* are as water compared with moral decisions. I also think that Dr. Hepburn does not answer the question he asked, which was, in the circumstance envisaged, whether a *Christian* could continue to hold his faith with intellectual honesty. He disagrees with Braithwaite in holding 'that an account of religion in terms of a moral way of life backed up by parable fails as a description of Christianity'. I notice that, from this point onwards, he never claims that what he includes in his 'answer' is *Christian* but only that it is 'religious'.

Enough has been said to indicate the value of this book. If some general critical reflections are added, they are not intended as an attack upon it.

(1) The front inside flap on the book's dust cover contains the very naïve statement that 'philosophers have been discovering that language has many functions besides the description of plain facts or the expressing of emotions'. Surely the only persons to whom this could be a 'discovery' are those who have held that philosophy could be extracted out of the common usage of simple indicative sentences tested by an empirical verification-principle which itself could not be proved by the only methods which they themselves allowed to be valid for proof? Other philosophers and people of common-sense have always been familiar with this 'discovery', and no one unaware of it could write anything hitherto regarded as philosophy or theology.

(2) Though Dr. Hepburn is far removed from the earliest form of so-called Logical Positivism, I cannot resist the impression that he is not infrequently still under its influence. He sometimes writes as though there is but one correct use of language called e.g. 'the logic of our language', itself connected with the now abandoned or greatly modified former verification-principle. Nor is it clear that he has fully studied the doctrine of analogy or the less complex idea of symbolic theology. Nevertheless he is entirely right in insisting that the theologian 'must establish some sort of contact-points between his special senses of the words he uses and the ordinary senses of these words'. To speak of God's 'love' and then to say that it does not mean this, that, and the other which human love means, can very easily land one in saying nothing positive whatever. But not all theologians are blind to this ever-present danger.[3] Further, ordinary speech is a web of metaphors (the 'softness' of an evening landscape,

[3]See, e.g. Prof J. Burnaby's little book, *Christian Words and Christian Meanings*.

the 'silvery' sound of a musical instrument) about which there is no 'logic', but which convey meanings. One can hardly describe anything to another, if it is outside his experience, except in speech which boils down to 'It is *like*' (and therefore not identical with and in some degree *unlike*) something the other already knows. The same procedure is often disguised rather than avoided in scientific treatises and is always used in books intended to help ordinary readers to comprehend advanced science. Some science deals with a collection of symbols or treats of experience in conceptual symbolism, recognizing a background or 'beyond', the mysteriousness of which increases with knowledge or penetrativeness by thought. Logical rules prove the truth of no premisses and therefore of no conclusions: they show that some conclusions logically follow from given premisses and that others do not. Statements about God may be logically or illogically related to one another, but the '*logical* nature of *a statement* about God' is either a meaningless phrase or else bears a meaning arbitrarily imposed upon it.

(3) It is a defect of Dr. Hepburn's book that it contains no discussion of faith, which is essential to religion and therefore to theology. He does not consider whether there is a form of religious faith which does not differ from the faith operative in science and in many of life's more significant activities. I must not say that he holds the opinion that only what is logically demonstrable can afford a reasonable basis for religious faith, but he sometimes writes as though he does hold it. He thinks it very relevant to put to theologians questions which appear in the books of other language-philosophers—How different would the world have to be before you would decide that you could not reasonably go on believing? What state of affairs would be incompatible with Christian belief, or just how different would the world have to be before belief would have to be declared senseless? Any theologian who claims to be dealing with actualities might well reply that he has enough on his plate without contemplating hypothetical and non-existent meals. And as Dr. Hepburn sincerely desires to believe, it is neither impertinent nor superfluous to put to him the same question, substituting a positive ending: What state of affairs would be compatible with Christian belief, or just how different would the world have to be before you would feel able to make the venture of faith and self-commitment involved in Christianity? I should be glad to read an answer which would not be a specification for a fool's paradise.

(4) The author cannot fairly be criticized for the selection he has chosen from modern theological works: they are certainly influential. But the reviewer finds it surprising that Dr. Hepburn (like other language-philosophers, as far as he knows) never attends to two of the greatest works of philosophical theology in English published in the twentieth century—the severely empirical work of the late Dr. F. R. Tennant

(*Philosophical Theology*) and the very different work of the late Dr. John Oman (*The Natural and the Supernatural*).

By way of contrast, if regular readers of the *Modern Churchman* who agree with its attitude in theology turn to books by Roman Catholics, they generally find unintended support for their own liberal standpoint. They will assuredly do so if they read this learned and lucid work by Jean Daniélou,[4] now very competently translated. To turn from *Christianity and Paradox* to this book is to enter another world and to encounter ample grist for Dr. Hepburn's mill. The first paragraph of its preface declares truly that all we say of God seems utterly unworthy, but this is amplified thus:

> 'We should wish, too, after everything we have said, to say the opposite. Because at one and the same time it seems that all we say of Him is true, and also untrue; for He is what we say, and yet He is not. He is, says Pseudo-Dionysius, all that is and nothing that is.'

This is not paradox but sheer contradiction: the result, words but no meaning. The atheist could say that God is 'all that is and nothing that is', if his respect for the convictions of others did not prevent his use of the word 'God' for what is strictly *non*sense.

The first two chapters, comprising more than a third of the pages, on God in non-biblical religions and in philosophers, can be studied with profit, though statement has too large a place over reasoning. Daniélou allows that there is a revelation of God speaking to man through the cosmos, conscience and the human spirit, though without the support of more positive revelation it issues in errors which are indicated. To philosophers the author, in accord with Catholic teaching, allows a knowledge of God and his attributes attainable by reason. He is equally aware that endemic in Christianity is the contrary claim that reason is a hindrance to an opposing knowledge of God by faith alone. He defends, while insisting on the limitations and dangers of, the one, and rejects the other. This is sound. For if God is Creator, and it is held that his inconceivably vast creation discloses to a creature, alleged to be made in his image, nothing of his nature and ways, there is no ground for trusting that any particular events within that creation and its history are Divine revelation. The author writes to show that philosophy, like non-biblical religions, can achieve knowledge of the true God, though it remains imperfect and distorted.

The remaining chapters expound Daniélou's beliefs about the God of Christian Faith, of Jesus Christ, of the Church, and of the Mystics—this last being a misnomer, as only the final few pages of it deal with the mystics. 'Revelation pre-supposes not only divine interventions in history, but a divine act in the spirit of men chosen by God, which makes them

[4] *God and Us*. By Jean Daniélou. *Dieu et Nous*, translated by Walter Roberts. (A. R. Mowbray & Co. Pp. 203. Price 22*s*. 6*d*.)

understand these interventions.' This, of course, if true, carries one a very long way, but in this book *it is a presupposition*. Then we also read:

> 'Theology is the attempt of the intellect in its various forms to comprehend and formulate the datum which Revelation presents in the crude state.'

The presupposition is exactly what is wanted to justify what theology has attempted to do and to claim for the alleged knowledge of God thus reached a superiority over any such knowledge otherwise attained. Elsewhere the author has claimed Revelation to be a more perfect knowledge of God than philosophy can attain and as being God's free gift. It is exceedingly strange that here he should refer to it as a datum presented 'in the crude state.' May one ask, Does the Revelation reveal its own crudity, or illumine the minds of men chosen by God to discover that it is crude?

Except for its first two chapters, this book is the exposition rather than the defence of a number of propositions in dogmatic theology. There are some criticisms of Protestant theologians and useful pages on meanings of some important biblical words. But the reviewer's outlook is so far removed from the author's that further comments might read like malicious travesties. He regards many of the dogmatic statements about God here offered as being those it is wiser not to know. Readers interested in such (by a writer who would wish, after everything he has said to say the opposite, but does not do so) may be advised, 'Jean Daniélou's your man.'

PIUS XII: AN APPRAISAL

EACH PONTIFICATE may be said to leave its mark on the history of the Roman Catholic Church, and this is a truism for the reign of Pius XII. Much of what has been said in the eulogies that followed his death on 9th October 1958 was justified. He was a born leader of his Church, and he combined long experience in European diplomacy with modernity of mind, interest in scholarship, and adroitness of touch in human problems. He was interested in the laity, and the laity responded. His spiritual gifts were obvious to the tens of thousands who thronged his audiences, and his pronouncements to representative bodies on subjects outside his immediate knowledge were often sound and penetrating. His adaptability of mind, exemplified in his support for the Liturgical Movement, has played its part in enabling the Roman Church to adapt itself to the emergence of a new middle-class in Europe and the Americas, more technically-minded but less mentally secure than its predecessor. This now provides political Catholicism with its most effective support; and thus, ground lost in the traditional strongholds of the Roman Church in Central Europe has been compensated by greater influence in the political and social thought of the West.

This perhaps has been Rome's major success in Pius' reign, but a price has been exacted. The alienation of the worker both on the land and in the factory in Europe seems to be final. The Worker-Priest movement failed. The war brought not leadership but political and moral trimming from the Vatican. The over-centralization of authority which characterized Pius' last years did not enhance its power for good, nor did the evidences of nepotism in this period. The promulgation of the Assumption Dogma in 1950 has consummated the division of Western Christendom as surely as papal acts during the Crusades perpetuated the cleavage between Orthodoxy and Catholicism.

Probably one of the most lasting influences on Pius' outlook was his twelve-year spell as Nuncio, from 1917—1929, first in Munich and then in Berlin. It was generally from the standpoint of Germany, or better perhaps that of Central Europe, that he appears to have viewed the future of his Church. German Catholicism occupied a key position, and the effect of its alienation would have been catastrophic. Hence, his policy towards Hitler's Germany differed considerably from that of his predecessor. He was elected on 2nd March, 1939, on the eve of Hitler's march into Prague, and this move secured his acquiescence, though the danger signals all over Europe were plain to see.

On 22nd March, 1939, von Bergen, the German Ambassador to the Holy See, reported that the new Pope had declined to associate himself with 'the protests of the democratic states against the annexation of Bohemia and Moravia to the Reich. He had given those around him to

understand that he sees no reason to interfere in historic processes in which from the political point of view the Church is not interested' (Tel. 37 of 22nd March, 1939, from Rome to the German Foreign Ministry, printed as Document 65 in *Documents* on German Foreign Policy, Series D, vi, p. 74). 'Historic processes' are often blunt instruments of justice. So far as the published records show, Hitler's subsequent career of aggression received no overt condemnation from Pius. There was no repetition of his predecessor's *Mit Brennender Sorge*. The manifest evils of the Hitler régime were not denounced, and this, as von Weizsäcker has pointed out (*Erinnerungen*, p. 337), had a demoralizing effect on the resolve of its opponents. The moral leadership of the world, even if Communism were the greater enemy, cannot be gained by such tactics.

Whether or not Pius hoped for an Axis victory is uncertain. That he should have chosen the spring of 1942 to open diplomatic relations with Japan suggests that at this time too he was prepared to accept the verdict of 'historical processes'. He seems also to have been prepared to use German successes in Eastern Europe for the advantage of his Church to the detriment of other Christian communities. When in the spring of 1941 the Axis armies overran Jugoslavia, the Orthodox minority in Croatia passed under the rule of Ante Pavelic. Between May and November they were visited with a series of murders, deportations and forced conversions. Eye-witnesses asserted that the gangs of Ustaci were often led and encouraged by Catholic priests. No denunciation came from Cardinal Stepinac, Archbishop of Zagreb and Pavelic's adviser, and none, so far as is known, from the Vatican. A detailed account of these horrors, accompanied by a protest, was forwarded, however, by Heydrich (later the Reichsprotektor of evil fame in Bohemia) to the German Foreign Ministry. Friendship towards the Orthodox Church, except at the price of extinction, cannot be placed to Pius' credit. Indeed, if anything, he contributed to deepen the existing rifts.

Similar effects on Western Christianity have resulted from Pius' interventions in the field of doctrine. Here, the way to the promulgation of the doctrine of the Assumption had long been marked out. The famous article in the Jesuit *Civiltà catholica* of 6th February, 1869, looked forward from Infallibility to 'the declaration of the dogma of the Virgin's bodily Assumption into heaven'. The hopes of the writer were now fulfilled. But the results may eventually be disastrous to Christendom as a whole. It has meant the final dethronement of Scripture and Tradition as the norms of Christian orthodoxy. For here is a doctrine which claims no connection with either, and looks back for its origin to Apocryphal and Gnostic writings which were rejected by the early Church. More serious than this, the elevation of the Virgin to the position she now occupies has put in jeopardy the central tenet of the early Christian faith, the Doctrine of the Trinity. The weaknesses of the traditional position was that

the work of the Council of Chalcedon was never extended to the Holy Spirit. Now, however, the work of sanctification, inspiration, and counsel attributed by former ages to the Holy Spirit have been ascribed to the Virgin. The Holy Spirit has thus become superfluous to Roman Catholic theology. This may be the mind of the Roman Church, but again, it was not that of the Early Church. The Holy Trinity has been replaced in practice by the age-old Mediterranean religious concept of the existence of God and a female counterpart, the 'First Idea' of Gnosticism, the Face of Baal of Palestinian and North African Baal worship. A historian may perhaps see in the popular cults of the Virgin and of Eva Peron respectively the symbols of a profound popular movement, leading, however, to the decline of Christianity as a historic religion, and its replacement by a more primitive level of religious experience. If that is so, over much of the world the last reserves of human religious feeling have been drawn upon. It is doubtful whether they will suffice to defeat the challenge of materialism and Communism.

That is the point to which Pius XII had led his Church. Over much of the world a religious myth confronts a materialist myth. The real peril to humanity is the division of mankind along these lines. If ever the Anglican Communion, with its emphasis on Scripture and Sound Learning and its theology of Reconciliation, were needed, it is to-day. The jovial and sympathetic old priest who has succeeded Pius XII may confuse historians of the Conciliar epoch and may rescue the name of John from infamy. But to arrest catastrophe will be the work of other Communions than his.

W. H. C. Frend

THE INTENTION OF JESUS' ACTION AT THE LAST SUPPER

By Rev. S. W. Cameron, M.A., Tutor in Extra-Mural Studies, University of Durham

Even when the theological approach to the Eucharist was a purely dogmatic one, historical problems have lurked in the background. For instance, it was in an appeal to history that Luther wrote the words 'Hoc est Corpus Meum' on the table in his dispute with the Zwinglians. Today, however, with over a century of biblical historical criticism behind us, theologians are inclined to be sceptical about critical methods, claiming that we cannot get beyond the element of interpretation to the actual facts about the ministry of Jesus.

Still, this does not necessarily prove that the critical method is merely negative. It simply shows that theologians have over-emphasized its analytical aspect by which different sources and strands of tradition are distinguished and classified.

The Results of Criticism

Let us illustrate this. Certain conclusions about the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper are well known and can be taken as established.

From a textual point it is now generally accepted that (*a*) the accounts given in Mark xiv, 22-25, and in I Corinthians xi, 23-26, are the earliest, and that (*b*) substantial agreement exists between them. In both, Jesus distributes a broken loaf with the words, 'This is my Body', and then gives a Cup which both writers associate with the idea of Covenant, though in different ways. Further, Mark connects the giving of a Cup with an eschatological promise of reunion in the Kingdom of God, a saying probably re-echoed by Paul in I Corinthians.[1] Too much stress must not be placed on the divergent Bezan version of the Lucan account, which places the 'Cup of Blessing' first—a 'trysting Cup', as Goguel calls it—before the bread. For nothing can really be proved from the mere suggestion of a Cup-bread order given by Paul in I Corinthians x, 26, while all that the *Didache* shows is a particular way in which the Eucharist was celebrated. We now know that the bread-wine order was followed by the members of the Qu'mran Sect in their religious meals, and this seems to me to go a long way towards confirming the reliability of the Mark—Paul records.

The view that the latter is the earliest account, followed by Mark's narrative some fifteen years later, must still go unchallenged.

Can we get any earlier? The Form Critics claim that we can. Jeremias, for example, argues that the language, style, and what he believes

[1]See M. Goguel, *Life of Jesus* (Engl. Trans., London, 1933), p. 448.

to be semiticisms in the Marcan Last Supper story, reflect a primitive Aramaic liturgical source. But a scholarly reply to this has been made by N. Turner[2], who points out that the Marcan narrative of the Last Supper cannot be treated as an isolated unit. The supposed liturgical language, together with the alleged semiticisms, can be found elsewhere in the Gospel. If this view is correct, can we say that Mark's account is more primitive than Paul's? Let us now try and glimpse the general picture these critical results give us.

As early as 1926 Lietzmann,[3] in his *Messe und Herrenmahl*, claimed to trace back to the New Testament itself two quite different conceptions of the Eucharist—the one seeing it as a religious fellowship meal (Mark) and the other as the Memorial of an atoning sacrifice explicable in terms of Covenant and Passover (Paul). The former only, he concluded, is true to the mind of Jesus.

Otto, however, finds in the breaking of bread the principal action at the Supper because it symbolized death.[4] More recently Jeremias has elaborated the theory that the rite can only be understood in terms of Passover.[5] The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has supplied us with a still further angle from which we can evaluate the evidence. In my opinion, they may even give support to the fellowship meal theory, for they reveal a community which regularly observed such a rite and about which we shall have more to say.

The analytic method then leads us to separate the different strands of evidence and demonstrates how difficult it is to determine what exactly Jesus Himself intended at the Last Supper.

We shall now try and see if there is a more synthetic and positive approach to the problem.

A Positive Historical Approach

Intellectual analysis alone cannot give us the key to history, because by intellect we cannot enter into the sympathetic understanding of the emotional forces which determine both the making and the writing of history. It is possible to argue that we must repudiate and discountenance intuitive feelings as a guide to historical inquiry. But then we should have to content ourselves with an entirely negative and conjectural approach to the historian's task and accordingly confine our historical studies to mere

[2]See 'Eucharistic Words of Mark' in *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1957.

[3]*Messe und Herrenmahl*, by Hans Lietzmann (Bonn, 1926), Eng. Trans., *Mass and Lord's Supper*, with Introduction by R. D. Richardson.

[4]R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (Eng. Trans., London, 1938), pp. 299–309.

[5]J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (Eng. Trans., Oxford, 1955), pp. 14–35.

phenomena—and indeed if we employ intellect alone it is difficult to see how we could ever transcend the relative circle of the phenomenal.

On the other hand, we may take the hint from existentialist philosophers like Jaspers[6] and affirm that we are not simply the spectators who view objectively the phenomenal of history but are ourselves existentially involved in the history. The real basis of a positive approach to historical problems becomes possible when we affirm that in genuine historical investigation communion between mind and mind actually takes place. That, in other words, the very substance of history, so to speak, is the encounter between personalities having the same sort of relationship to a similar subject. For example, in the case of the Eucharist we are concerned not simply with a past fact but with a present one as well. In other words, the religious significance of the Eucharist for Christians to-day may well provide the necessary insight into the original intention of Jesus in the Upper Room.

A positive and constructive attitude to history becomes possible when we no longer regard religious experience as derived from an objective historical scheme as in traditional orthodoxy, but regard it instead as providing the intuitive vision into the inner meaning of the historical.

A Unifying Hypothesis

The proper concern of history, according to Jaspers, is not the universal but the concrete and particular.[7] Now it seems to me that Bultmann ignores this important insight of existentialism when he attempts to explain the historical Jesus in terms of the community mind of the Apostolic Church. But is it not true that when we read the Gospels for ourselves we cannot but feel that a genuine historic character with a distinct individuality of his own stands behind them, and it is just this kind of feeling that the sort of intuition is given which makes a positive approach possible?

The Individual and the Particular are lost sight of when we try to rationalize them in terms of the community. The principal characteristic of the particular is not similarity but contrast.

Now the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels seen as a whole place the emphasis on the interior life—the intention of the will and faith in God as Father. This is a complete contrast to the Jewish Community-religion with its ceremonial law and concern for the outward act. Jesus' religion then was a state of consciousness, and therefore his teaching was not intended to communicate a theology of 'Paternal Theism', but to

[6]See K. Jaspers, *Reason and Existence* (Eng. Trans., London, 1956), pp. 77–106. Also R. Bultmann, *Problems of Hermenuetics, Essays Philosophical and Theological* (Eng. Trans., S.C.M. Press), pp. 234–261.

[7]K. Jaspers, *Reason and Existence*. It is an underlying theme of his whole work.

arouse the inner life. Hence the purpose that can be recognized behind his words and parables is essentially an *evocative* one. This is not to ignore eschatology with its belief in a coming eschatological order, for eschatology is, in the last analysis, the attempt to clothe in mythic form and objective imagery man's inward longing for eternal life.

But it is not simply in the teaching of Jesus that we find this purpose to arouse the internal life—it is equally evident in his deeds. His table-fellowship with publicans and sinners which, as C. H. Dodd points out,[8] is a regular feature of his ministry, seems to have had the effect of arousing in those unfortunates a sense of gratitude for the divine concern, and what were the works of healing but results of faith awakened by Jesus? In other words, all his acts have a parabolic character, i.e. their purpose was to *evoke*. At this point we are reminded that Jülicher, Otto and Jeremias are agreed in placing the Last Supper in the category of the acted parable.

This is My Body

The table-fellowship with sinners points to meals at which Jesus was present and which had a definite moral effect on the participants. These meals may also be reflected in the stories of the Feeding of the Multitude and the Johanine account of the Transformation of Water into Wine when those who ate with Jesus came under the influence of his personality.

But the religious fellowship meal is as old as religion itself and appeals to man's sense of a spiritual sympathy pervading the cosmos. Sharing in the common loaf realizes this oneness (and accords with the principle of manna, for example). Thus in the Qu'mran Sect the common meal symbolized the unity of the 'Sons of the Covenant', binding them together in a harmony as wide as the stars.

Dr. Kuhn[9] has stressed the points of similarity between the Qu'mran meal as described in the Manual of Discipline and the Last Supper of the New Testament. In the Essenic rite there was a real meal shared by the inner circle of male disciples, and the presiding priest acted the part of 'pater familias' by breaking the bread. Kuhn concludes on the grounds of a detailed comparison that the Last Supper therefore belongs to the kind of tradition represented by the Scrolls and must not be identified exclusively with the Passover as Jeremias tries to do. He suggests further that the Qu'mran meal may have had a quasi sacramental significance parallel to that quite definitely given in the Manuel to the ritual immersions. But I would suggest that an additional clue may be found in a statement of Josephus which Kuhn quotes but makes no specific comment

[8]C. H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, p. 90–101.

[9]See K. G. Kuhn's article, 'The Meal', in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, edited by K. Stendahl, 1957, pp. 65–93.

on. It is the passage in which Josephus tells us[10] that in the opening and closing prayers of the Essenic Meal they 'do homage to God as the Giver of Life' *(ἀρχόμενοί τε καὶ πεαυόμενοι γεραίρουσι Θεὸν ως χορηγὸν τῆς ξωῆς)*. There is surely the hint here of a profound symbolism. Consequently the meal was not simply an 'eating in common' but, as life-giving food and drink, it pointed to the divine bestower of life.

In other words, we might define the significance of the meal in terms of life-symbolism. This is further confirmed in the Legend of Joseph and Aseneth, which Kuhn also cites as reflecting the Qu'mran type of fellowship meal and in which mention is made of 'the bread of life and the Cup of immortality'. And again, in the primitive liturgy of the Didache, the Cup and Bread are also regarded as symbols of immortality. Obviously to the same category of 'vitalistic sacramentalism' (if we may employ such a clumsy term) belongs St. Ignatius' description of the Eucharist as the 'medicine of immortality' (Epistle to the Ephesians xx, 2).

This raises the question, Did Jesus invest the Supper with a wholly new meaning, or did he simply render explicit the significance of the religious meal as such? We may narrow down the problem by formulating the question, 'What was the principal action at the Last Supper? Otto[11] finds this in the breaking of bread as symbolic of death, but as Jeremias[12] points out, the fraction was necessary in any case for the distribution and the opening of Jesus' explanatory formulary over the bread —'Take . . . Eat' makes it clear that the distribution was the principal action. It was in regard to the sharing out of the loaf that Jesus pronounced the formula all our New Testament sources agree in rendering, 'This is My Body', though it is difficult to determine precisely what was said in the original Aramaic. Dalman[13] re-translates the Greek (*τοῦτό ἐστιν-τὸ σῶμά μου*) back into 'Den hu guphi', but he is incorrect in using 'hu' to represent *ἐστι(ν)*. The intransitive verb would not have appeared in the original, and Jeremias[14] has argued that bisra—flesh underlies the Greek word *σωμα*. 'Flesh and blood', he points out, represents a natural Aramaic idiom (basar—dam), whereas 'guph is nowhere coupled with blood'. The twin concepts contained in the two Eucharistic formulae, 'This is My Body . . . This is My Blood', point to 'flesh and blood' in the original.

On the other hand, it must be asked why, if basar was used, was it not rendered by *σαρχ*, its exact equivalent? All our main authorities give *σωμα*, and though there is some manuscript evidence for *σαρχ*, it is easy to see how *σαρχ* could come to replace *σωμα* in some documents in view of

[10]Josephus, *De Bello Jud.* II, viii.5 (Flavii Josephi Opera, edit. Benedictus Niese, Vol. VI, p. 179). Whiston's rendering of this passage is incorrect and misleading.

[11]R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, p. 300.

[12]J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 142.

[13]G. Dalman, *Jesus—Jeschua* (Liepzig, 1922), p. 128.

[14]J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 140.

the strongly realistic Eucharistic theology which developed at an early date (especially in the light of John vi). Conversely, if σαρχ was employed in the oldest manuscripts, it is difficult to see why it should have come to be dropped in favour of σωμα. But if we agree with Dalman, then Jesus' words must have meant 'This is I myself'.

The distribution of bread which has been blessed by prayer in which mention was made of God as the Giver of life coupled with such a formula reveals the religious significance of the meal. God is exalted as the Source of Life and the recipients participate in Him who is the Life. As an acted parable, therefore, the Last Supper was intended to appeal to the inner self and to stimulate that awareness of the Life which is the same thing as having 'that mind which was also in Christ Jesus'.

We cannot, of course, separate the Last Supper from the passion of Jesus, though the connection is not best explained in terms of a vicarious sacrifice. So long as the visible and empirical presence of Jesus provided the disciples with an external crutch to rest upon, they were incapable of realizing for themselves his religion of complete interior dependence upon the Father, rendering them independent and free of the objective world. The withdrawal of this empirical existence through death was necessary if the seed implanted in them was to come to fruition. Like bread, the consciousness of Jesus had to be assimilated within one's self. 'It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you.' Three of the Resurrection appearances are associated with a meal, and in view of the evocative character of the Last Supper it is easy to see how, from a psychological viewpoint, the celebration of the Eucharist could have aroused the experience of the Risen Lord of Life.

The Cup of the New Covenant

Because the significance lies in the meal as a whole, a separate and distinct meaning cannot be attached to the Cup, as Goguel has argued.[15]

Wine symbolized joy and well-being, and the fruit of the vine was given to the new bride to confer fertility. Consequently the Cup is another Life-symbol. But while Mark renders the Cup formula as 'This is My Blood of the Covenant', Paul gives it as 'This is the Cup of the New Covenant in My Blood', i.e. it represents not blood but the New Covenant.[16] Whereas the Marcan language reflects the sacrificial terminology of Exodus xxiv, 8, the Pauline version re-echoes the very important passage about the New Covenant in Jeremiah xxxi, 31-34. Here we have an Old Testament anticipation of the personal religion of Jesus which is one of inward experience in total contrast to the externality of the older dispensation. Paul was certainly aware of this contrast (Galatians iv,

[15]M. Goguel, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 450–451.

[16]Mark xiv, 24; I Corinthians xi, 25.

24-26), and he realizes fully the essence of the New Covenant religion of Jesus. For him it is the inward operation of the life-giving Spirit (II Corinthians v, 6-8). Drinking the New Covenant Cup symbolizes, then, the drinking in the religion of pure inwardness which is non-sacrificial and non-ceremonial in character.

Does Paul give us the actual words of Jesus as well as his original ideas?

This is difficult to say. Though 'of the Covenant' is not an easy phrase to translate back into Aramaic, it is I think possible to attempt to reconstruct a very primitive saying by combining the Pauline saying about the *New* Covenant with the eschatological and obviously primitive promise given with the Cup in Mark (xiv, 25). Thus we get, 'The Cup of the New Covenant' (from Paul), 'I will drink it new' (from Mark). We have thus a verbal balance through a play on the idea of newness. Such parallelism is surely strongly suggestive of an Aramaic idiom. Further, such a complete statement is actually found in some Marcan manuscripts, and thus reflects the earlier reference to 'New Wine' in Mark xi, 2, where Jesus uses the metaphor to justify his eating and drinking. The whole of the latter passage is illuminating, with its illustration of the Bridegroom who will be taken away from his disciples, and it may be compared with the Water into Wine story of John ii.

Do this in Remembrance of Me

In I Corinthians xi, Paul ascribes to Jesus the command, 'Do this in remembrance of Me'. To what extent is he here also giving us the mind of the Master himself? The point really involved is whether or not the Memorial is something objective or subjective. Jeremias argues in favour of the former view, contending that it means the setting up of an external Memorial before God like that of the Passover.

If, however, we interpret it in accordance with the inward religion of Jesus himself, the subjective view is perfectly intelligible and credible. And as we have seen, Paul certainly grasped the essential contrast of the Gospel over against the Old Testament religion of Law.

Of course Jeremias[17] cannot find much evidence in contemporary Judaism for interpreting the command in terms of *human* memory, because such subjectivity is the distinctive peculiarity of Christianity.

The important point is that the command is consistent with the mind of Jesus quite apart from whether or not we have here an actual saying once uttered by him. We cannot say with absolute certainty what formula Jesus must have used at the Last Supper, but the essential thing is that, as an acted parable, the value of the meal cannot be estimated. It is neither a sacrament effective 'ex opere operato', nor a sacrifice communicating something from without.

[17] J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 159–165.

It is symbolism relative, as all symbolism must be, to the subject. To take any other view of symbolism is to turn one's back on the trend of philosophy which, following Descartes and developing through Kant to the existentialism of our own day, has become increasingly psychological. The religious value of the Eucharist springs from its nature as a fellowship meal which, as a symbol, speaks to the inner self and arouses the consciousness of life. All eating and drinking involves the absorption into another field of animation. Psychologists tell us that we possess a subconscious awareness of this fact which determines our reactions to the world around us even when we are not consciously thinking of food. This shows the effectiveness of food and drink as a symbol for, as such, by the law of association it touches of an awareness of the objective loss becoming gain within. Thus it is suggestive both of death and life—of Cross and Resurrection.

Finally, it is not to be expected that in these days when theology is dominated by dogmatic problems, a purely religious interpretation of the Eucharist in terms of Life will meet with general approval. Nevertheless, when Roman and Anglo-Catholic theologians like Mersch and Ramsey are thinking of the Church in more organic—or vital terms—we may express the hope that such a presentation might unite Christians at a point where hitherto they have been very much divided.

THOMAS WALTER MANSON, 1893—1958

By Rev. Professor M. Black, D.Litt., D.D., F.B.A., Principal of St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrew's

Thomas Walter Manson was born in 1893 in Tynemouth, Northumberland, the son of a schoolmaster. His early education was received at Tynemouth High School and Glasgow University, which he entered in 1912 to prepare himself for the Presbyterian ministry. His course was interrupted by the first world war, during which he served as an officer in the Royal Field Artillery; he was wounded in 1916, but returned to France and was demobilized in 1918. After the war, Manson resumed his studies in Glasgow and went on to Cambridge, where he completed his course for the ministry at Westminster College. At the same time he became a member of Christ's College, and in 1923 obtained a First Class in the Oriental Languages Tripos. After a short spell at the Jewish Institute at Bethnal Green, he settled down for some ten years in the small country charge of Falstone, Northumberland.

It was here that his most famous book, *The Teaching of Jesus*, was written. He produced many books and learned articles, but it will undoubtedly be for his *Teaching* he will be remembered. His understanding

of the Synoptic Son of Man as a collective title, standing for Christ *and* his disciples, till 'he stands alone, embodying in his own person the perfect human response to the regal claims of God', must continue to command the respectful attention of all serious students of the New Testament.

After a brief tenure of the New Testament Chair in Mansfield College, Oxford, Manson was appointed Rylands Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester. It was here that his life-work was done, a large part of it under the difficult conditions of the second world war, during which he served in civil defence, first as Operations Officer in the War Room of No. 10 region—Carlisle to Chester, including all industrial Lancashire—and then as officer in the University Home Guard. At the same time he took full charge of St. Aidan's Church in West Didsbury.

The business of theology remained Manson's chief concern, and, with the return of more normal circumstances, he set himself the task, as Dean of the Faculty of Theology, of building up, in close co-operation with all the theological colleges in the area, a strong department of Theology. He was a born teacher, and his lectures were always stimulating and enlivened by his own special brand of humour. (Outside the faculty he was best known in Manchester for his brilliant and witty laureation addresses.) He became Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University in 1945, and served in this office for four years.

Dr. Manson was a Free Churchman, proud of his inheritance, and, with all his many other activities, he continued his preaching ministry, and his services were always at the disposal of the Church of Christ (of whatever denomination). He served in his own Church and the Free Churches as an Elder, Interim Moderator, Chairman of the Free Church Federal Council, and, in 1953, he was elected to the highest office of the Presbyterian Church of England, that of Moderator of its General Assembly.

As a scholar and teacher, Dr. Manson had the rare gift of combining specialized scholarship with popular presentation in the best sense. His scholarly interests ranged over a wide field. As a result of his early studies in Semitics and Oriental languages, he had a first-hand acquaintance with even the less well known branches of this subject; he read Ethiopic and Armenian, and was at home in the difficult field of Rabbinics. But he always brought his wide learning to bear directly on Biblical scholarship, and, in particular, on the study and exposition of the New Testament. In addition to his *Teaching of Jesus*, he is best known for his *Sayings of Jesus*, originally part of a joint work on the *Mission and Message of Jesus*, in which he collaborated with H. D. A. Major and C. J. Wright, but which was published separately in 1949. Two other smaller works recently completed are *The Servant-Messiah* (Cambridge, 1953), and a short book on *Ministry and Priesthood: Christ's and Ours* (Epworth Press, 1958). He also published widely in learned journals; some excellent work, for in-

stance, has appeared at different times within the last thirty years in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* and was given originally as lectures; among these may be mentioned his series on *Materials for a Life of Christ*, and another on the *Pauline Epistles*.

A Memorial volume is in preparation and will include a full bibliography of Dr. Manson's writings.

Manson received many honours. In addition to his D.Litt. and Honorary D.D. from Glasgow, Honorary D.D. degrees were conferred on him by Cambridge, Dublin, Durham, Pine Hill (Nova Scotia), and the University of Strasbourg. He became a Fellow of the British Academy, a corresponding member of the Göttingen *Akademie der Wissenschaften*, and an Honorary Member of the American Society for Biblical Literature.

Manson's was one of the most strenuous ministries of our time, yet he carried his heavy responsibilities, as he did his many honours, lightly—one might almost say light-heartedly—for he had an infectious buoyancy of spirit, which, together with his keen sense of humour and lively wit, made him the most agreeable of colleagues and companions. The emphasis in his life, however, no less than in his teaching and writing, was on ministering and the Ministry.

This is well illustrated by a story he once told: 'F. C. Burkitt came to Westminster in my student days and read a paper to the College Theological Society on this subject (Schweitzer). In the course of the debate that followed the point was made that if the life of Christ is construed on the lines of thorough-going eschatology, it can only be described as a gigantic mistake. Burkitt's reply was in effect: "Mistake or no mistake, it has sent Schweitzer himself to Africa as a medical missionary"..

. . . The thing that really matters (Manson commented) in the story of Jesus is not the eschatological theory but the ministerial practice. Christ's Ministry makes nonsense of the expected sequel. Similarly, the thing that really matters for Schweitzer, the thing of eternal import, is the thing that on his own theory he ought to call "interim ethic". The work in Africa that commands our unstinted admiration and respect is a continuation of what Burkitt calls the Prologue. The interim Ethic is the permanent moral force: the Prologue has become the whole drama.'

Manson often spoke of the Christian obligation to continue the Ministry of Christ; his own life and ministry was a continuation of the Prologue, and will itself be a permanent moral force.

We have lost a great Christian scholar and gentleman.

RECENT STUDY OF THE SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF JESUS*

By Dr. S. G. F. Brandon, Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of Manchester

I

Since the ending of the second world war, no significant 'Life' of Jesus has been published in either the English-speaking countries or on the Continent. This in itself is a remarkable fact when the great studies of the 'historical Jesus' of the earlier period are recalled and when we consider the immense interest in New Testament studies since 1945, which has called into being, besides a great mass of books, two new journals devoted to the subject.[1] Why, we may naturally ask, should such an apparent decline of attention in so basic a theme as that of the life of Jesus himself have occurred during these post-war years?

I have used the words 'apparent decline of attention' advisedly, because, however it may appear, there has been no real lessening of interest in the history of Jesus of Nazareth—indeed, it is difficult to see how there ever could be. But the fact that no recent attempts have been made by the leading New Testament scholars to reconstruct the life of Jesus as an historical personage is significant, and it does call for explanation.

The cause is, without doubt, theological, or, perhaps more exactly, inspired by theological interests. The situation concerned here is worth investigation, for an understanding of it will help to reveal something of the nature of the serious crisis in which the academic study of Christian Origins is at present involved.

If we trace out the course of New Testament research during the past century, we see that, after the great initial task has been performed of establishing the best available text of the New Testament documents, interest turned first to investigating the literary tradition which lay behind the extant form of the Gospels, particularly of the three so-called Synoptic Gospels. In this country the generally accepted findings of this activity were set forth by the late Dr. B. H. Streeter in his great work entitled *The Four Gospels*, which was first published in 1924. But already the attention of scholars, especially in Germany, was turning to what was logically the next subject for investigation, namely, the formation of the oral tradition about Jesus and his teaching before that tradition was committed to writing. This line of investigation came to be known in this country as Form-Criticism, and, although its findings never achieved such

*A lecture given in the University College of North Staffordshire.

[1] *New Testament Studies* (published under the auspices of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, ed. M. Black) and *Novum Testamentum*, ed. E. C. van Unnick, Leiden.

accepted definition as did those of Source-Criticism in Streeter's *Four Gospels*, its influence has been immense and abiding.

Now all this study, both of the literary sources of the Gospels and the oral tradition which lay behind them, was inspired by the belief that by the accepted technique of historical investigation it would be possible to understand the origins of Christianity, and particularly the facts about the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. It was regarded as one of the strongest arguments in favour of the truth of Christianity that it was an 'historical religion', which description was usually taken to mean that the origins of Christianity were rooted in history.[2] This claim in turn implied that, if the history of Palestine during the first decade of the first century of the present era were properly investigated, the truth of Christianity would be demonstrated. As an example of this attitude of mind, we may notice the immense popularity of a book by one Frank Morison entitled *Who Moved a Stone?* which was first published in 1930, but which is scarcely heard of to-day.[3] This book took the line that, if the evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus were examined as in a court of law, the truth of this foundational miracle would be found to be beyond all reasonable doubt.

This was a popular book, and it was so because it represented what was then the general attitude of mind in orthodox Christian circles. But, when it was published and was enjoying such popularity, it was already behind the times, for it did not correspond to the general trend of the conclusions then reached by specialist scholarship. Indeed, it has taken a long time for the logic of historical investigation into the origins of Christianity to be fully appreciated even by theologians, and even now there are many who refuse to face the issue realistically. This issue may be briefly described as follows. By claiming that Christianity derives its authority from certain happenings which took place in Palestine approximately between the years 4 B.C and A.D. 30, Christians in effect were making assertions about historical events, and they believed, moreover, that those assertions could be substantiated by historical investigation. Accordingly, they were eager to investigate the New Testament writings as historical documents, convinced that thereby they could get back to the historical Jesus who lived in Palestine during this period and to the beginnings of the Christian Church. What was apparently not realized was that to bring the Christian case into the forum of historical judgment meant that the accepted method of historical investigation and the accepted criteria of historical evaluation had to be employed without exception — nothing

[2]Cf. S. G. F. Brandon, 'The Historical Element in Primitive Christianity', in *Numen* II (1955), p. 158 sq.

[3]There is a 1951 edition of the book, and it has recently appeared in a paper-back edition.

could be held back as sacrosanct or as being subject to other standards of judgment.

Gradually the result of such an enquiry became apparent. It was increasingly realized that the accounts which we have in the Gospels of the life and teaching of Jesus represent interpretations at least at second or third hand. Moreover, these interpretations were conditioned by a variety of motives which could only be understood in terms of the circumstances of the first generations of Christians in Palestine and elsewhere, probably in Rome, Alexandria, Ephesus, or Antioch. Now this meant that with any incident of the life of Jesus recorded in the Gospels, we could never be certain that we had an accurate objective account of what actually took place or that the incident was described in its right context, which is equally important. Such conclusions, of course, in no way condemn the sincerity of the Gospel writers; but they remind us that these writers were not concerned to compose accurate historical records, but to preserve a revered tradition for the edification of the faithful. This does not mean that the Gospels are without value as historical documents, indeed far from it. But their primary value lies in the evidence which they provide of what Christians, living in various places in the Roman Empire during the last decades of the first century, believed about Jesus, whom they worshipped as their divine Saviour. These Gospel interpretations were, of course, originally inspired by the historical Jesus of Nazareth; but to him we cannot penetrate, although we may reasonably make some important inferences about his character and career and about the general nature of his teaching. In other words, from the strictly historical point of view, on almost every aspect of the traditional orthodox presentation of Jesus, it is necessary to reserve judgment and to return the verdict of 'not proven'.

Now such a verdict, if it had concerned some matter of merely academic interest, e.g. whether Nero was responsible for the burning of Rome, could be accepted with equanimity. But, when the issue concerns one's religious faith, such a verdict cannot be regarded with detachment. It is not surprising, therefore, that Christian scholarship has reacted strongly, as the danger involved here became more clearly apprehended. One of the most notable and influential forms that this reaction has taken is significantly associated with the famous German scholar, Rudolf Bultmann. I say that this association is significant, because Professor Bultmann was one of the pioneers of Form Criticism, and between the wars he was regarded as one of the more radical of New Testament critics. But it would seem that Professor Bultmann came to realize, especially as a German Evangelical Christian in need of a firm and dynamic faith with which to meet the tragedy of Nazi domination and Germany's ultimate downfall, that the findings of historical research into the origins of Christianity had a negative, if not an undermining effect, so far as personal religious faith was concerned. Consequently, he has maintained that faith in the truth of the

Gospel cannot be established by historical research, but can only be perceived as existentially valid.[4]

Professor Bultmann's reaction, though most notable, is typical of the general trend of New Testament scholarship—and we must not forget in this context that most New Testament scholars are professing Christians and often hold teaching appointments in their several Churches. It might indeed be fairly said that, since the last war, New Testament scholarship, especially in this country, has become, by way of defensive reaction, more concerned with the theological than with the historical significance of the New Testament writings. Hence, preoccupation with the historical Jesus of Nazareth has tended to give way to a deepening interest in the Christ of primitive Christian faith and devotion.

However, I think that we may safely say that this shift of interest cannot be permanent, because in the final analysis Christianity bases its authority not on mystical experience but on historical fact. Consequently essential reference must ever be made to the origins of Christianity in Palestine in the first century; in the last resort the question will always be asked and must be answered—what happened then? Who was Jesus? What did he really say and do?

And it would seem that such questions are likely to be asked with increasing urgency in the next few years under the stimulus of the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Since the discovery of these now famous Scrolls in 1947, many rather hasty and ill-judged things have been said about the bearing of their evidence on the beginnings of Christianity. Such premature utterances were to be expected under the impact of so amazing a discovery. However, their proper evaluation will take a long time, for many complicated problems are involved; but it is inevitable that these writings should throw much new light upon the situation in Palestine contemporaneous with the life of Jesus of Nazareth and the founding of the Christian Church, and such new knowledge is bound to quicken interest in the historical origins of Christianity. In one direction in particular I believe that this interest will be stimulated, and, since I have myself given special attention to the issue involved, I intend to devote the rest of my lecture to its discussion.

II

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the consequent excavation at Qumrân of the settlement of the community which apparently owned them have called attention again to the events in Palestine during the first century which led up to the Jewish revolt against Rome in A.D. 66 and the destruction of Jerusalem four years later by the Roman Army under the

[4]Cf. S. G. F. Brandon, 'Myth and the Gospel', in *The Hibbert Journal*, li, pp. 121-8; 'De-Mythologizing the Gospel: the Significance of Dr. Bultmann's Undertaking', in *The Modern Churchman*, xliii, pp. 86-98.

command of the Emperor's son, Titus. The evidence at Qumrân has shown how an isolated religious community could be disastrously involved in this struggle: for the Scrolls seem to have been hidden for safety by their owners and the excavations indicate that the Qumrân community was attacked and destroyed by the Romans in A.D. 68—certainly those who hid the Scrolls never returned to recover them.[5]

Now the fate which overtook the Qumrân community raises the question of what happened to the Jewish Christian communities of Palestine during the four years of disastrous war with Rome. I have endeavoured to show in my book, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*,[6] that the original Christian community at Jerusalem undoubtedly perished in the destruction of the city in A.D. 70, while the effects of this catastrophe on the infant Christian Church generally were so profound that after A.D. 70 the Christian movement, which hitherto had been directed and controlled from Jerusalem, had to be reconstituted.

In the book, which I have just mentioned, I discussed what the domination of heathen Rome meant to pious Jews in Palestine—how it outraged the fundamental principles of their religion, because they regarded Palestine as the holy land of Yahweh, their god, and believed that they, his people, should pay allegiance only to him. Moreover, the maladministration of their Roman governors was constantly provoking their religious feelings. In this situation of great emotional stress the age-long belief in ultimate divine deliverance through the intervention of Yahweh's Messiah grew more intense. Already in A.D. 6, when Judaea was first placed under direct Roman rule and a census had been ordered for fiscal purposes, Jewish fanaticism had found violent expression under the leadership of a Galilean, named Judas, who, as the Jewish historian Josephus tells us, reproved his fellow-countrymen 'for consenting to pay tribute to the Romans and tolerating mortal masters, after having God for their Lord'. Judas was killed by the Romans, but he succeeded in founding a patriotic party known as the Zealots, who were vowed to the liberation of Israel from the yoke of heathen Rome.[7]

It has been customary in Christian thought in the past to look upon Zealotism with disapproval and to feel that it was necessary at all cost to deny that Jesus and his disciples could have had any sympathetic connection with such a political movement. But the logic of this attitude was never faced out. It never seemed to be realized that to present Jesus as indifferent or antipathetic to the ideals of the Zealots meant in fact depicting him as unpatriotic and as dissociating himself from the life of his people in a matter of most profound concern to them. To represent

[5]Cf. R. de Vaux, 'Fouilles au Khirbet Qumrân', in *Revue Biblique*, lxi, pp. 222-3.

[6]London, 1951, second ed., 1957.

[7]*Wars of the Jews*, ii, 118.

Jesus as such is surely to portray him in a very unattractive light, especially since, after the 'resistance' movements of the last war, we have learned to admire a small nation that struggles bravely for its liberty against a mighty aggressor. The Zealots were as justified in their struggle against the unjust tyranny of Rome as the French 'resistance' fighters were justified in their struggle against the unjust tyranny of Nazi Germany.

However, when we come to enquire into the reason for the orthodox representation of Jesus as dissociating himself from any involvement with the Jewish national cause against Rome, we find that theological considerations, not historical evidence, have been the chief determining factor. It has been felt necessary, in the interests of the traditional soteriology, that Jesus should have kept himself clear from any participation in the political life of his people, that he should only have been concerned with the kingdom of God and not with the kingdom of Caesar, even though its domination of the little Jewish nation was manifestly unjust.

If, however, we look at the evidence of the Gospels not as theologians but as historians, we see grounds for a different estimate, and one, moreover, that recommends itself as being inherently more probable.

The key-fact to the situation is surely the charge upon which Jesus was executed. The evidence of the Gospels is quite unanimous on the point, and it is in agreement with the testimony of the Roman historian Tacitus.[8] It is that Jesus was put to death by Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor of Judaea, as a revolutionary. This basic fact then is not disputed; what is disputed by the Christian sources is the justice of the condemnation. According to the Synoptic and the Johannine Gospels, Pilate had been forced to execute Jesus as a revolutionary by the Jewish authorities, backed up by the Jerusalem mob. It is explained that the Jewish authorities had already condemned Jesus to death on a charge of blasphemy, but, since under the Roman government of the land they had not the power to carry out their sentence, they had to invoke the aid of the Roman governor, who had what was legally known as the *jus gladii*, i.e. the authority to execute on a capital charge. However, since blasphemy was not a capital offence in Roman law, it became necessary to change the charge and to present Jesus to Pilate as a rebel against the Roman government of Judaea.

Such, in brief, has been the traditional Christian explanatoin of the fact that Jesus had been crucified by the Romans as a revolutionary. If this explanation be critically examined, many serious reasons will be found for doubting its validity; but, if we let this issue pass for the moment, we may more usefully consider the significance of two other facts about which there can be no dispute. The first is that, whether the Jewish leaders did

[8] 'Auctor nominis eius Christus Tiberio imperitante per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicis adfectus erat'. Tacitus, *Annales*, xv, 44.

persuade Pilate or not in his judgment, there must have been enough apparent evidence to make the condemnation of Jesus as a revolutionary seem plausible. After all, if it were a case of a trumped-up charge, there were many other crimes of which Jesus might have been accused. We must accept it, then, that a charge of sedition against Rome could most easily be made out against Jesus. The second fact for consideration is the evident concern of the Gospel writers to transfer the blame for the Crucifixion from the Romans to the Jews. They do not question the fact that Pilate was actually responsible for ordering the execution, which was carried out by Roman soldiers. What they endeavour to show is that the Roman governor was either deceived or forced by the Jews into committing this terrible act of injustice. Now, from the theological point of view, it was the fact of dying innocently that was of essential importance in the presentation of Jesus as the Saviour of mankind; who was actually responsible for bringing his death about was theologically irrelevant—in fact St. Paul asserts that the daemonic powers, associated with the planets, had really crucified Jesus.[9] Why then, we may ask, this intense concern on the part of the Gospel writers to exculpate the Romans and blame the Jews, or, in other words, to show that, although Jesus was executed by the Romans as a revolutionary, it was all a mistake for which the Jews were responsible? I would myself suggest that the answer is probably to be found in the fact that all the Gospels were written after A.D. 70, the year of the destruction of Jesusalem—indeed, there is reason for believing that the Markan Gospel, the earliest of the Synoptics, was actually produced in reaction to that event.[10] Now, when we recall that the Jewish war against Rome, which was waged from A.D. 66 to 70, caused a great wave of hostility among the Gentiles against the Jews, who at the beginning of their revolt had committed some terrible atrocities, it can easily be understood that Christians then were embarrassed by the fact that their Master had been executed as a Jewish revolutionary. That they should have sought to explain away the fact in the way recorded in the Gospels, thereby putting all the blame on the hated Jews, is also consequently understandable.

Now this line of interpretation may sound plausible, but you will surely ask whether it is supported by any other evidence? I think that it is, and that it all goes to form an intelligible picture.

First we may notice that, according to the Gospel evidence itself, Jesus had included among the inner band of his disciples, the 'Twelve', one who was called Simon *ὁ Ζηλωτής*, i.e. Simon the Zealot.[11] Now, as we have already seen, the Zealots were the extreme nationalist party among the

[9] I *Cor.* ii, 6-8. On the *archontes* see *Reallixikon für Antike und Christentum*, i, 193-202, 631-633, 810-817.

[10] *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (second ed.) pp. 185-205, 270-3.

[11] Cf. Brandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-5, 198-9.

Jews at this time, and so the fact that one of the Twelve Disciples was actually a Zealot is one of immense significance. The fact has naturally been found very inconvenient by orthodox scholarship, and attempts have been made to explain it away.[11a] For example, it has been argued that Simon was called 'the Zealot' because he was very zealous. But, in answer to this contention, it may be objected that it is strange that only one of the Twelve was distinguished in this way; moreover, considering how opprobrious the term 'Zealot' became as a result of the Jewish War, it is difficult to believe that Christians would have continued to use such a dangerous title with which to describe one of the disciples of Jesus. Another attempt to avoid the issue here has taken the form of explaining that Simon was a Zealot until he became a disciple of Jesus, when he then abandoned his Zealot principles. But this interpretation can scarcely be convincing, because it would mean that a leading disciple was still called by the dangerous and reprobated title of 'Zealot' after he had adjured such a faith as incompatible with his discipleship of Jesus. The fact may indeed be inconvenient for the traditional exegesis, but its evidence must be accepted by the historian, showing, as it does, that the profession of Zealot principles did not prevent a man from becoming one of the leading disciples of Jesus. And the witness of this fact fits in remarkably with the curious silence about Jesus's attitude towards the Zealots which is preserved in the Gospel tradition. I call this silence remarkable advisedly, because, whereas we are told at some length what was the attitude of Jesus towards other Jewish parties of his day, one of them being of quite minor significance, i.e. the Herodians, nothing whatsoever is said of the Zealots, whom we know were very active, especially in Galilee.[12] We may indeed wonder why we are told of Jesus's condemnation of the Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Herodians, while nothing is said of the Zealots, except that we do know that Jesus included a Zealot among his Twelve Apostles.

Another fact of great significance in this context, although it is usually glossed over by orthodox exegetes, is that the disciples went about, at least on some occasions, armed. This may sound a surprising thing in view of our conventional picture of the Apostles as, with the exception of Judas Iscariot, a band of saintly and peaceable men, intent only on spiritual matters. But Luke in his Gospel (xx, 35-38) lets out the significant fact that, before going to Gethsemane, Jesus issued definite instructions that the disciples were to arm themselves, but such instructions were not necessary, for they were already armed. This fact in turn explains why the men

[11a] The fact was originally found inconvenient for the author of the Markan Gospel, see Brandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 198-9.

[12] There is a similar silence about the attitude of Jesus to the Essenes, which may also be significant in view of their possible connection with the Zealots, as some scholars are now beginning to think. Cf. C. Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1958).

sent by the Jewish authorities to arrest Jesus were heavily armed; they were clearly expecting armed resistance, and, as we know from the Gospel record, armed resistance was offered, but not successfully.

Next we have to consider the witness of the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem in this connection. It is usual to idealize this event, laying emphasis upon the meekness of Jesus, riding upon an ass, amid the glad salutations of the people, waving their branches of palm. But the scene must have appeared very different to the Roman authorities and the pro-Roman Jewish aristocracy, intent on keeping the peace. Here was a popular demonstration, welcoming into the city on the eve of the Passover, when Jerusalem was crowded with an excited mass of pilgrims, one who was acclaimed in terms of political Messianism as the 'son of David', the great warrior-king of ancient Israel, whose coming would mean the return of the glorious Davidic kingdom. Moreover, Jesus is recorded to have gone on to clear the Temple of its money-changers and merchants—in doing this he was in effect attacking the prerogatives of the pro-Roman sacerdotal aristocracy who controlled this very lucrative side of the Temple's activity:[13] in effect, in this action, Jesus would have appeared as a popular leader against the vested interests of those Jewish authorities who supported the Roman rule. And it is significant that the Gospel tradition records that there was a *stasis*, i.e. an insurrection, in Jerusalem at this time.[14]

There remains at least one more important piece of evidence which we must consider in the time left at our disposal. The three Synoptic Gospels each contain an account of an incident in which Jesus was asked whether the Jews should pay tribute to Rome. Now the answer of Jesus has been so often quoted by orthodox scholars as an authoritative pronouncement on the relations of Church and State that it has rarely been considered critically in its original historical context. First, however, let us be careful to notice that Christian tradition did in fact preserve the memory of an incident which explicitly connected Jesus with the burning question of contemporary Jewish nationalism, namely, whether it was right that the Jews should pay tribute to the Romans—and let us also here recall the proclamation of Judas of Galilee, the founder of Zealotism, that payment of tribute to heathen Rome was disloyalty to God. Now, according to the Gospel account, the Jewish authorities put this crucial question to Jesus, in order 'that they might catch him in talk'. These Jewish authorities are described as 'certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians' (*Mk.* xii, 13)—the description is significant, for these men would have been representatives of the pro-Roman Jewish upper-classes, whose interests were

[13]Cf. R. Eisler, ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΣΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ (Heidelberg, 1930), ii, pp. 491-4; *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist* (London, 1931), pp. 489-490.

[14]*Mk.* xv, 7; cf. *Mt.* xxi, 10: ἔσείσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, λεγουσα, τίς ἐστιν οὗτος.

then bound up with the maintenance of the Roman rule.[15] In other words, the question about the tribute was put by those Jews who were concerned that it should be paid to keep the peace and who were, therefore, anti-Zealots. In putting such a question to Jesus, they surely suspected him as dangerous to their own interests. Jesus is recorded to have replied, after emphasizing the ignominy of the enforced use of Roman coinage by the Jews, 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' Now, if this answer is considered in terms of its historical context, it must seem as a clever evasion of a dangerous situation. Jesus was, in fact, being asked to define his position in regard to the Zealot cause. If he answered that it was wrong for the Jews to pay tribute, he would lay himself open to arrest by the pro-Roman Jewish authorities for uttering sedition. If, on the other hand, he agreed with them that the tribute should be paid, he would show himself to be unpatriotic and would compromise his position with his countrymen as a supporter of Roman rule. The answer that he gave not only baffled his questioners but was fully in accord with Zealot principles, because to any patriotic Jew Judaea belonged to God and not to Caesar and, therefore, should pay tribute only to God.

The inclusion of this account of the Tribute Money question in the Markan Gospel raises other questions which I have dealt with in the book which I have mentioned. What is of crucial importance for us here is the fact that the incident is actually preserved in Christian tradition, even if it was interpreted later in another sense. It serves powerfully to confirm the evidence of the other material which we have noted, namely, that far from dissociating himself from his people in their struggle for freedom from the oppression of heathen Rome, Jesus was understandably sympathetic with their aspirations and so far identified himself with them as to make a charge of sedition the most likely one upon which he might be executed by the Romans.

And so I would end by saying that, although the 'quest for the historical Jesus'[16] has declined in interest in recent years with the majority of New Testament scholars, a re-assessment of the political factor in Primitive Christianity, particularly as it concerns Jesus, is becoming more urgent, and it is likely to be productive of some useful conclusions from the historical point of view.[17]

[15]On the identification of the Herodians and their pro-Roman policy see H. H. Rowley, 'The Herodians in the Gospels', in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, xli, pp. 14-27. The political alignment of the Pharisees in this connection could be various, but the association of these particular Pharisees with the Herodians in asking about the tribute is surely significant.

[16]*Op cit.*, pp. 191-2.

[17]The present writer hopes to publish a full-length study of this subject, which will serve as a sequel to his *Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*.

REVIEWS

THE ARMOUR OF SAUL*

In this well-written little book Dr. Cleobury deals with a fundamental issue for Christian people who are alive to the crisis which now confronts their faith. Briefly, this issue includes the question of personal immortality and that of the relevance of the answer which Christianity claims to offer thereto.

In the first part of his essay Dr. Cleobury sets out to show that whatever other interests men may have in life, their interest in what happens to them when this life ends is basic, and it decisively effects the way in which they live their life here. Dr. Cleobury briefly discusses the various intimations of immortality which many thoughtful people feel, and he adds a personal note of considerable significance: 'It sometimes flashes into my mind with a curious convincingness that the very fact of my life-long preoccupation with survival, and my intense desire for it, are evidence that the thing will happen.' After such a *cri de coeur*, criticism seems out of place. However, to the present reviewer, whose profession renders him very sensitive to the significance of the variety of mankind's religious beliefs, what Dr. Cleobury tacitly assumes in this connection is disturbing. Beneath all his argument runs the assumption, so typical of Christian scholars, of the validity of the Western evaluation of human life and destiny. According to this evaluation, consciousness of individual personality constitutes the highest form of existence, with its necessary corollary that the persistence of this consciousness after death is eminently desirable. But a large part of mankind in the East for more than two millennia have held a contrary opinion, and that opinion has been set forth with as much metaphysical profundity as the Western view has been advanced by its philosophers. Quite clearly this essential divergence between Western and Eastern doctrines of Man must be faced out more realistically, if a truly adequate estimate of human nature and destiny is to be achieved.

In the second part of his book Dr. Cleobury provides a concise and valuable discussion of certain aspects of the problem of Christian Origins, the significance of which is steadily being more appreciated by New Testament scholars. Those who are not bemused by the old shibboleths of the 'Tübingen' witch-hunt and who study the New Testament documents without doctrinal presuppositions, the fact that Paul's gospel differed fundamentally from that of the Jerusalem Christians is of key importance. The original Jewish disciples, who formed the mother-church of Jerusalem, were preoccupied with the historical Jesus, whom they identified with the Messiah of Israel and whose significance they interpreted within the categories of Judaism. It was Paul's genius to see in the Crucifixion an event transcending its historical context in that it was designed by God to effect the salvation of all mankind. Paul's conception of the person and work of Jesus was thus admittedly an innovation, but, according to Dr. Cleobury, 'This does not mean we have to-day to regard it as false. Even if Paul's thought was influenced by mystery religions and gnostic cosmologies, we can regard these as being as truly part of the Divine *praeparatio evangelica* as were the laws of Moses.' Dr. Cleobury sees much of the traditional presentation of Christianity a preoccupation, similar to that of the Jerusalem Christians, with the events of the life of the historical Jesus, which leads to fruitless efforts to establish the historicity of the records of the Virgin Birth and other miracles or to interpret the meaning of what is alleged to be the actual teaching of Jesus. This means, in Dr. Cleobury's metaphor, that David tries 'to fight the Goliath of modern materialism in the armour of Saul', thus unnecessarily encumbering himself and weakening his efforts.

**The Armour of Saul*, by F. H. Cleobury. (James Clarke, London, 1957. Pp. 126. 9/6.)

This small volume is accordingly to be commended to members of the Modern Churchmen's Union as a valuable contribution to a very important issue by a fellow-member of their Union.

S. G. F. Brandon

ESSAYS IN THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGION*

How far is it possible to write a book on comparative religion without an apologetical motive? In dealing with religion at its more primitive stages, or in works of a purely historical or phenomenological nature, the difficulty is not so apparent, but when comparative studies of the great living faiths of mankind are attempted some scale of values, some standard of reference, seems to be demanded, and most Christian writers on the subject tend to measure other faiths by the yardstick of Christian orthodoxy.

At Sundry Times is an expansion, in five chapters, of lectures delivered before the University College of Wales, at Aberystwyth, early in 1957, in which Professor Zachner seeks to show how the deepest insights of religion as it developed in India, and the prophetic ministry of Zoroaster in Iran find their fulfilment in the Christian Gospel. To this he has added an appendix in which the Qur'anic conception of the nature and mission of Christ is carefully discussed.

The suggestion that only an agnostic can investigate the phenomena of religion impartially is dismissed by Professor Zaehner as nonsense (p. 12), and with this verdict the writers of the other two books would agree. In the study of religion, although an objective and purely scientific approach to the phenomena of religion is desirable, there is undoubtedly a need for sympathetic insight and understanding. These qualities of mind are more likely to be found in one to whom religion has significance through personal commitment. Yet, as Professor Zaehner remarks (p. 16), 'For the believer in any religion the comparative study of religions is dangerous'. Is this the reason why the study has been comparatively neglected in our theological colleges? However dangerous, the problems raised need to be grappled with honestly by all those who feel called upon to interpret the truths of religion to others.

In his book Professor Zaehner reveals those qualities of sympathetic insight and understanding to a marked degree, and yet the apologetic motive is evidenced in his valiant attempt to show how orthodox Roman Catholic Christianity 'fulfils' the deepest insights of Indian mystical religion as found in the movements towards belief in a Personal God in the later Upanishads and the Bhagavad Gita, and in the Bodhisattva doctrine of Mahayana Buddhism (p. 194). To an orthodox Christian belief in a personal, creator God is fundamental, but is not the concept of Nirguna Brahman more fundamental to Indian mysticism? And does not Hinduism, as influenced by the non-dualism of Sankara, and the qualified non-dualism of Ramanuja, tend to think of devotion to a personal God as but a stepping-stone to a mystical experience in which the realization of self-identification with the Brahman is the goal? The Indian mystic might well retort that the deepest insights of Christianity find their fulfilment in Hinduism.

Professor Zaehner indicates that even a rapprochment with Islam might be possible because 'so far as his Christology is concerned, Muhammad, in the Qur'an nowhere denies and sometimes affirms specifically Christian beliefs' (p. 216). He points out the weakness of the Biblical Realism of H. Kraemer (pp. 195 ff) and the 'bibliolaters' within Protestantism, and would have them note that 'the credentials of Islam,

**At Sundry Times*, by R. C. Zaehner. London. (Faber & Faber, 1958; pp. 230. 21/-.)
Religions, by D. W. Gundry. London. (Macmillan, 1958; pp. vii-ix+189. 16/-.)
So Great a Mystery, by Kenneth Walker. London. (Gollancz, 1958; pp. 224. 18/-.)

both as an historical and as a "biblical" religion, are very much stronger than are those of Christianity' (p. 196).

Professor Zaehner nowhere minimizes the contrast between Indian and Semitic religions, a contrast which is somewhat slurred over in Mr. Walker's book. In *So Great a Mystery* Mr. Walker finds the key to religion in a mysticism attained at super-conscious levels of experience, and reveals a deep sympathy for Indian religious development which he expounds in three chapters which form the core of his book (chapters 6-8). He refers, again and again, to inner and outer forms of religion. He fails to grasp the deeper insights of Confucianism, finding its significance merely in outer forms, and sums it up as 'the religion of the gentleman' (p. 158). He also fails to come to grips with prophetic religion, and the fundamental differences between the Semitic and the Indian emphases.

In his whole method of approach Mr. Walker differs radically from both Professor Zaehner and Mr. Gundry. Mystical experiences of a personal nature, the first occurring when he was a child of seven, had a profound psychological influence upon him, leading him to the conclusion that a purely scientific approach to reality can never bring men to a satisfactory solution of man's fundamental problems. Under the guidance of Gurdjieff he came to realise the importance of different levels of consciousness, and found in Indian religion the developed techniques by which supernormal levels of consciousness might be cultivated.

Mr. Walker believes that it is at these super-levels of consciousness that the seers and prophets of the great world religions have partaken of the same religious experiences. Consequently, in the 'essence' as distinct from the 'accidents' in Religion, the great world religions approximate to each other, and lead to the same goal. He sees the aim of religion to be that of assisting man's spiritual evolution towards a state of 'wholeness', and would equate the Christian concepts of 'Kingdom of God' and 'Eternal Life' with the 'Self-realization' of Hinduism, the 'enlightenment' of Buddhism, 'Satori' in Zen and 'Ma'rifa' in Sufism. (p. 159, c/f p. 219).

It is possible together to abstract the essential truths of a religion from the means by which those truths are expressed? And are those essential truths so nearly the same as Mr. Walker suggests? There seem to be radical differences in what are deemed to be essential truths between the prophetic religions of Semitic origin and the Indian mystical religions. As Professor Zaehner points out, they do not mean the same thing by 'revelation' (p. 70; pp. 170 ff). As regards their essential teaching concerning the ultimate ground of the universe, and the nature and destiny of man there is surely wide disparity of belief.

In his preface to *Religions* Mr. Gundry states that 'the point of view of this book is openly Christian' (p. ix), and though he tries to acknowledge the good in other religions, the reviewer feels that he fails in regard to that insight and sympathetic understanding of non-Christian faiths which in Professor Zaehner's book are so apparent. His classification of the religions of the world into 'undeveloped, monistic and monotheistic' is altogether too superficial. To class Hinduism and Buddhism as monistic religions needs considerable qualification. The four features of Buddhism, summarized on page 111 are only very partially true of Buddhism as it is practised as a living faith by millions of Buddhists in the world to-day.

Mr. Gundry attempts to cover far too much ground in some 170 pages, and the need for compression, and the neglect of some of the best sources available, has led to an unwarranted distortion. The book is marred by numerous errors of fact which seriously impair its usefulness as a guide to the theological students, teachers and intelligent laymen for whom it was written. It is only possible here to indicate a few of the many errors the book contains. Nineveh fell in 612 B.C. and was destroyed by a coalition (p. 43). The authorship of the Tao Te Ching is uncertain (p. 76).

Confucius was not the founder of Confucianism, nor is his tomb in Peking (p. 78). The neighbours of the Hebrews included non-Semitic peoples, the Philistines, the Hittites and the Mitanni (p. 118). Muhammad did not seek refuge in the Christian land of Ethiopia, though some of his Meccan followers did (p. 136). One can hardly speak of small Muslim pockets in China, where the Muslim population is over ten millions and vast territories in the north-west are dominated by Muslim influence (p. 137). It is not true that Christianity was banished from Asia and Africa by the collapse of the Roman Empire at the time of St. Augustine. Nestorian Christianity spread and flourished in parts of Asia for centuries, and the Coptic and Abyssinian churches continued in Africa (p. 146).

The accounts of non-Christian religions are, in some cases, so scrappy and biased as to be tendentious. The account of Taoism, admittedly brief, shows little appreciation of the great contribution of that religion, as a salvation religion, to Chinese life and thought. Such phrases as 'the religion soon degenerated into a system of magic' (p. 78), and 'Budhism has largely supplied China with its more specifically religious features' (p. 84) reveal the author's ignorance of the strength and resilience of Taoism in the religious life of China.

The three books, read together, reveal the vastness and complexity of the subject with which they deal, and indicate the immense erudition that would be needed to produce a much needed synthetic study of Comparative Religion in which the contribution of each of the great religions of mankind had due recognition.

D. Howard Smith

MR. GLADSTONE'S RICHELIEU

In 1894, the *Life and Letters of Dean Church* was edited by his daughter, Mary. Selling cheaply on second-hand bookstalls for some years past, this volume has introduced a younger generation to an attractive representative of the Church of England in Victorian times. Little has been added until the recent publication of Mr. B. A. Smith's *Dean Church—The Anglican Response to Newman*.[1] Mr. Smith's well written and sympathetic biography now enables us to see the subject whole and full face. If there are no warts in this portrait, it is not because Mr. Smith is not objective in his appraisal, but because the life and character of Richard William Church are singularly free from blemishes. Though he lacked the intellectual stature of Newman, his sanctity had a more urbane quality. This retiring scholarly man of letters was humble to the point of self-abnegation. A man of unworldly simplicity, he shrank from publicity, he never overrated his own stature and it required the strong and persistent pressure of his friends to persuade him to leave his obscure country parish for the deanery of St. Paul's.

His career falls into three periods; as an Oxford don, within the inner circle of the leaders of the Tractarian movement in its first phase; as a country parson at Whatley in Somerset; and as Dean of St. Paul's. Mr. Smith's biography does full justice to each phase.

Church was essentially a modern man and in this sense the sub-title, 'The Anglican Response to Newman', though fulsome is no misnomer. Fourteen years younger than Newman, he idolised the Tractarian leader in the early years of the Oxford Movement. He came under the influence of Newman and stood by his friend in the dark days. Resigning his fellowship at Oriel in support of Tract 90, he also played his part as Junior Proctor in the dramatic vetoing of the condemnation of the Tract in the University Convocation. Years later, when Dean Church wrote his brilliant

[1]By B. A. Smith (Oxford University Press, 30/-).

and judicious history of the Oxford Movement 1833-1845, he wrote to Lord Acton 'I have not attempted a complete criticism of Newman, partly because I feel it beyond me, partly because it is so against the grain'. The influence of Newman over Church was never a spell. When the tragic collapse came, and Newman submitted to the uneasy yoke of the Roman obedience, Church never wavered. He went through no period of morbid doubt; he never deviated in his adherence to the Church of England.

His essential moderation shows itself in other ways, too. He deplored Pusey's narrowness and rigidity. It wounded Church to find a man so learned and religious as Pusey so blindly unjust and intemperate. Though a founder member of the Oxford Movement, Church refused to belong to the English Church Union and confessed he had 'always been rather afraid of it'. The champion of Newman in the Oxford days, he was never in touch with the *Avante Garde* of Anglo-Catholicism, though in the ritualistic battle his sense of justice led him to support those whose views he did not share.

Besides his moderation, Church was also a man of judgment. Perhaps the two qualities go together and combine to make him the man he was. His own studies had almost acclimatised his mind to 'Evolution' before most clergymen had even heard of it. So he remained level headed over Darwinism, as he did over 'Essays and Reviews'. He deplored the outcry over Temple's appointment to Exeter. It was this quality of judgment in Dean Church that appealed so strongly to Gladstone who wrote in 1878 'There is no one whose ultimate judgment would carry more weight with me'. Not the least interesting part of Mr. Smith's book is that which describes the relationship between the Dean of St. Paul's and the Liberal Prime Minister.

It may be some comfort to frustrated country clergy in these days to learn how difficult and troublesome were Church's early years in a country parish. When he went to Whatley he had no parochial experience and found himself culturally isolated. He found conversation with his parishioners difficult. Two sermons a week were a real burden to him. He had everything to do himself. It says much for his character and perseverence that he laboured unstintingly, taking night classes to teach his farm labourers to read and organising paper-chases for them. But Church, more often than his modern counterpart, had other strings to his bow. As one of the leading spirits in establishing *The Guardian,* he wrote frequently for it and the life of a scholar-journalist was a profoundly happy and satisfying one.

Whether in his country parish or his London deanery, Church is an attractive figure. Mr. Smith's book brings out the quality of the man of whom Mark Pattison had remarked, when Church had defeated him in examination for an Oriel Fellowship, 'there was such moral beauty about Church that they could not help taking him'.

W. G. Fallows

VOCATION AND MINISTRY

'The Ministry of the Church of England is just dying on its feet. Both here and in the overseas Churches, we are heading right now for a major crisis through sheer lack of ministerial man power.' So says the Bishop of Southwell in his book *Vocation and Ministry*[1] in which he makes many wise and penetrating comments on the central problem of the Church to-day.

The decline in numbers is well known and this in itself may not be so serious as is often assumed. A lowering of quality is a much more serious threat. In spite of the

[1]James Nisbet, 1958; 12/6.

best endeavours of those responsible for recruitment, selection and training, the proportion of graduate among those being ordained has decreased and the poor academic quality of many of the graduate candidates is a cause for further despondency. Some would say that it is vocation that matters; that good lads will make faithful pastors and diligent priests; that we should cast our net wider and be ready to reduce our not very exacting academic standard to enable such men to find their place in the already inadequate ministry of the Church. The Bishop of Southwell, although he advocates a radical overhaul of the academic preparation for the ministry, will have none of this. He realises too clearly that the battle the Church has to wage is primarily an intellectual battle. The clergy need to be men of some quality of mind as well as of character to provide the leadership we need to-day. 'The reason', the Bishop says, 'why people no longer take religion seriously is simply that they are ceasing to believe in it, and that many are unable to believe in it'.

Too many definitely weak men are being ordained and, in the Bishop's view, the minimum standard accepted by the C.A.C.T.M. selectors is too low. 'Not every minister need be a scholar, but he must, altogether indispensably, be a man able to think and trained to think. If his thinking is slack, flabby and cliché-ridden, no amount of warm devotional piety will enable him to communicate the message to a sceptical and hard-boiled generation. It is mental confusion quite as much as the old Adam which stands between men to-day and Jesus Christ'. Weakness does not imply any lack of conviction. Speaking from knowledge and experience, the Bishop says 'What frightens me about some of the young men at their ordination is their appalling certitude'. The irony of the situation is that the weakest candidates cost the Church more than the abler ones. The Church is now spending more on training (£280,000 in 1958) than on all the other central work of the Church.

The Bishop is wide awake to another danger that is inherent in our modern predicament, namely the loss of independence and initiative on the part of the parochial clergy. He confesses himself to be less than enthusiastic about the revision of Canon Law. 'I do not want the clergy to be so placed as to be able, or think themselves obliged, to look up the answers at the end of the book. It would indeed be disastrous if the clergy were to develop a civil service mentality and refer every decision higher up. There is, therefore, need for a zealous vigilance in framing the policy of the Church of England. No legislation or ruling can be right which does not safeguard the authority and responsibile independence of the incumbent'.

The Bishop pleads for a closer association of the Theological Colleges with the Universities and, in particular, that more use should be made of the Theological faculties and 'The Red-brick Universities'.

The most important practical suggestion for meeting the immediate need for more clergy is that there should be a supplementary ministry of men engaged in other professions who would be ordained priests. This, of course, would relieve the pressure so far as administration of the Sacraments is concerned, but it leaves most of the other problems unsolved. It might well be better to have fewer services rather than more priests, especially if the supplementary ministry is only going to be available for taking services. No doubt, there are parts of the Anglican Communion where the Bishop's suggestion would be beneficial, but it is doubtful whether it would work well in England.

It is to be hoped that the Bishops and indeed the Church at large will weigh carefully the many wise things the Bishop of Southwell has to say in his important and timely book.

W. G. Fallows

Canon Judd who has edited the latter volume in his preface makes the following quotation from the late Lord Oxford's autobiography. 'It would be invidious to pick and choose among living preachers, but so long as the Church of England can attract to her pulpits men of such diverse and original gifts as the Dean of St. Paul's (Inge) and the Bishop of Durham (H.H.) she can at any rate keep alive a great tradition' (p. 17). Inge and Henson can be yoked together without either towering over the other not only as the most distinguished preachers of their generation but also as the two most outstanding personalities within the Anglican ministry in the first quarter of this century. What Canon Judd writes of Inge applies equally as well to Henson: 'a man of unique individuality concerned only to speak the truth, with a supreme contempt for contemporary claptrap and clichés' (p. 6). Hence what they preached repays study to-day because they both in their own distinctive fashion grappled with fundamentals.

But while Inge regarded ecclesiastical institutions and the Church of England in particular as necessary instruments for the attainment of goodness and truth, Henson considered that most men should be content to accept in faith the paradoxes and contradictions of life and pursue goodness in furthering the life of those institutions in which they happen to find themselves. It is thus in keeping with his own perspective that the first reprint of his works should be a collection of his ordination charges which he gave as Bishop of Durham together with his last visitation charge and the ordination sermon which he preached on the jubilee of his own ordination. Through the charges breathes a spirit of sane piety. They present the Englishman's picture of the ideal parson, a man of God whose authority depends as much if not more upon his own example as his office. Henson thought little of popularity. For him sincere affection was a product of respect, which a man, he considered, would command who respected himself. 'Self-respect, based on self-knowledge, and chastened by self-criticism is the key to right behaviour in the thousand situations of social intercourse. It is the very principle of "the royal law according to the Scriptures"—that law which sums up one side of human duty: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" ' p.107). He shows himself acutely aware of the difficulties and temptations of the parochial clergy: on that account in spite of a formidable exterior he gained the personal loyalty of those to whom he was bishop. The collection of Inge's sermons 'Goodness and Truth' show a profound thinker proclaiming in clear terminology the Christian solution to problems which the preacher so often shirks, although they are the layman's problems, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the Trinity, the uses of pain, the efficacy of prayer, the problem of evil spirits, the nature of religious faith. There is also included the sermon preached by Inge at Henson's consecration. He spoke of Henson as follows after mentioning him as his dearest friend, 'It has been his lot to assume each charge amid anxiety and even suspicion, and to lay it down amid universal regret and warm affection'. This also proved true when Henson left Durham. Both these books would make an appropriate gift to anyone who is being ordained to the ministry. They are voices from an age which might to such a one seem outmoded, but one proclaims an ideal which the cleric of to-day could well imitate, and the other gives a statement of eternal truths in a fashion which still commands attention because it is honest.

H. C. Snape

**Ad Clerum*, by H. Hensley Henson (S.P.C.K., 9/6).

**Goodness and Truth*, sermons by W. R. Inge. (A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 13/6.)

EARLY CHRISTIAN DOGMA

How did the dogmas of the early Church grow out of Primitive Christianity? This is the question which Professor Brandon asks at the beginning of the introduction to his excellent translation of Professor Werner's work.[1] The answer given by the writer is clear. The key lies in the non-fulfilment of the expected *Parousia* of Jesus and the final cataclysmic events which were associated in man's mind with it. The story, therefore, of the development of Christian dogma is one of the gradual abandonment of the basic teachings of the New Testament period. Thus, in the first part of his book the author traces the disintegration of the eschatological doctrine of Christ's work of salvation and the gradual dissolution of the original doctrine concerning His Nature. In the second part he shows how these vital doctrines were replaced by the early Catholic doctrines of Redemption and the Trinity, derived from a synthesis of Hellenistic thought and Biblical exegesis.

There is a great deal to be said for this line of approach, and moderately expressed, giving full weight to the other factors present in forming Christian beliefs in the first century A.D., this work could have been a land-mark in the history of dogma. To a student of martyrdom and the persecutions for instance, it is clear that the influence of late Jewish apocalyptic teaching had a profound influence on the ideas of the more extreme followers of the Faith. Persecution was regarded as the proof that the Last Days were at hand, and the Roman authorities were seen as personifications of Anti-Christ. This is a theme which the author could perhaps have developed to more advantage. Moreover, the concept originally associated with this outlook, of Christ as an 'angelic being', the 'Lord of lords' and 'only Ruler of Princes' (i.e. of other angels) influenced the development of the subordinationist trend in Christology down to the mid-fourth century.

The discussion of the background of Arianism is one of the most valuable in the whole work. Most text-books point out that both Arius and the Anomoean party in the Arian controversy in the final analysis regarded Christ as a 'super Angelic Being', and therefore one belonging to Creation. 'There was when he was not'. This view, though logically deducible from Scripture, struck at the root of concepts of Redemption and human Resurrection held by Athanasius and the West. It was one of the causes of the confusion and bitterness which marked the controversy. Professor Werner gives the evidence and sets the whole Trinitarian debate against the background of the ideas of the primitive Christian community. This in itself is a notable contribution to the study of doctrine.

As against this, the author's inspiration from Schweitzer's *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* is too much in evidence. A work based on a single idea seldom succeeds entirely. Was mistaken eschatology the sole factor which determined the development of Christian thought? Here, the progress of the Christian mission in the first two centuries may be instructive. At first, not surprisingly, the Christian message, with its emphasis on the last times, made an immediate impact throughout the length and breadth of Asia Minor. The Younger Pliny's description of the abandonment of country shrines in Bithynia *circa* 112 by the inhabitants in favour of Christianity is a case in point. But this phase did not last. Paganism reasserted itself rapidly in Bithynia as elsewhere. Further south, we are told by Epiphanius (*Panarion,* li, 33) that towards the end of the second century there was no longer a Christian community in Thyateira, though this had been one of the original Seven Churches. Those who joined the Church under the influence of eschatological teaching alone soon gave it up. Their outlook is illustrated by an interesting statement

[1]Martin Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma.* An historical Study of its problems. (Eng. tr. and Introduction by Professor S. G. F. Brandon), pp. 352+xvi and one plate (A. & C. Black, 1957. 30/-.)

attributed to a Christian leader in Pontus in *circa* 200. 'If it (the Second Coming) does not happen, as I have said, believe the Scriptures no more, but let each one of you do as he will'. (Hippolytus, *In Danielem*, iv.18.1.; Werner, p. 41). If Christianity had meant no more than that, people would have taken his advice, and the Church would have degenerated into just one more of the Palestinian prophetic cults which Celsus describes at this period (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, vii.9).

There was more in the early Christian hope than the Parousia. The author has tended to ignore the other strands of late-Jewish thought which influenced the Christian outlook. The impact of the Wisdom literature and of the school of Philo passes unnoticed. As I Clement shows, the New Israel was conceived as the summing up and orderly continuation of the Old, with cataclysms far in the future. Most people expected to live out their normal span of life. Nor must the 'creatureliness' of Christ be exaggerated. At least by the turn of the first century Christians were worshipping Christ 'as God', and not as an angel. The balance was already being held between late Jewish eschatology and evolution, and the distinctively Christian interpretation applied to both.

Professor Warner has been unlucky, too, in the moment at which he wrote. In 1940-41 the great new archaeological discoveries of the Scrolls and the Gnostic library of Naq-Hammadi had not yet been made. In revising his work for translation he would have been wise to have reconsidered his ideas in the light of these discoveries. He might have found much to have supported his thesis. At first sight the parallels now revealed to have existed between Essenes and Christians before A.D. 70 in matters of liturgy and organisation are striking. Indeed, any book on the formation of Christian doctrine which leaves this evidence out of account is to some extent limited in value.

This said, however, it can be stated fairly that the book is an important one, and worth bringing to English readers. Historians of dogma have tended to gloss over the influence of the delay of the *Parousia* in moulding the Church's doctrines. There has been a tendency too, to minimise the effects of the real differences of approach between the Palestinian Christians represented by St. Peter and St. James, and the Hellenistic-Jewish interpretation preached by St. Paul. The author corrects both tendencies. He has written a difficult, but also a courageous and challenging work at a time when both qualities are demanded of Christians.

W. H. C. Frend

LAMB TO THE SLAUGHTER*

There is a curious significance in the fact that, whereas the comparative study of religion was mainly initiated by liberal thinkers last century, to-day the subject is becoming increasingly popular with Catholic scholars. The chief reason for this seems to be that the richer liturgical content of Catholicism predisposes the Catholic scholar to a more sympathetic insight into the ritual practice of other faiths, and, invincible in his conviction of the supreme authority of his own faith, he thinks that he sees in these others significant signs of mankind's aspiration after that whch he believes has its divinely ordained fulfilment in Catholicism. Protestant scholarship, on the other hand, is congenitally suspicious of ritual, and so finds no inclination to concern itself with the meaning of the rites of other religions, which on Scriptural grounds it rejects as false.

**Lamb to the Slaughter*, by Brother George Every, S.S.M. (James Clarke, London, 1957. Pp. 128. 7/6.)

This little book by Brother Every, of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham, constitutes an interesting indication of English Catholic thought of this order to set alongside the more elaborate studies of Roman Catholic scholars on the Continent. Brother Every apparently feels that he is breaking new ground here, for he speaks of the temptation of the theologian 'to evade the problem of the relation of Christianity to other kinds of religion'. And he goes on to say: 'This is not only a problem of historical origins, but of the place of the mythological imagination in Christian thinking.' It is rather surprising, in view of his very evident concern with this issue, that Brother Every nowhere makes reference to the work of Professor E. O. James, especially of his *Christian Myth and Ritual*, which appeared as far back as 1933.

Brother Every's main theme is the meaning of the institution of sacrifice (it is again surprising that he never mentions Professor E. O. James' *The Origins of Sacrifice*, 1933, which would have provided him with much useful material). Quite rightly he believes that the data of Palaeolithic culture should first be interrogated concerning the beginnings of this basic feature of religious thought and practice. In his interpretation of this evidence, as elsewhere in his essay, Brother Every is often very elusive in the sequence of his thought; this is unfortunate, since he has many pregnant things to say, and it is often difficult to relate them to the data concerned. It would seem that he believes that in the Palaeolithic era the ritual slaying of beasts in sacrifice developed from what he calls 'the ritual hunt', and that originally beasts were sacrificed 'as holy manifestations of divine energy and life'. The essence of sacrifice accordingly lay in the communion made by the sacrificers with this divine energy and life through their partaking of the substance of the victim. This aspect of sacrifice was understood by and incorporated into the religions of antiquity, with the exception of that of Israel, where emphasis was laid upon the element of propitiation. Christianity 'recovered what the Jews had lost, and the Gentiles in their own ways retained, a sense of the immanent presence of the divine victim sacrificed, once for all in one historical event, represented and remembered in the eucharistic act'. This meant that, despite its Jewish origins, by the beginning of the second century Christianity had 'assumed the outward form of a mystery religion'. From this point Brother Every goes on to illustrate his thesis from the history of the Liturgy and the doctrine of the Atonement.

It is obvious that in covering so vast a subject in 128 small pages statements are made about matters of specialized knowledge which could only be justified by long dissertations which took adequate account of the often divergent interpretations of the authorities concerned. It would, accordingly, be easy to criticize Brother Every's argument seriously on almost every page, but to do so would be to miss the significance of his work. It is indeed a notable advance in theological thinking when a Catholic scholar can see Christianity as being closer to paganism in certain essentials than to Judaism. Perhaps Brother Every will not resent the suggestion, which is made in all sincerity and true appreciation of his work, that he elaborates his theme with a full discussion of all pertinent issues and with adequate documentation, and that in particular he takes account of the symposium entitled *Myth, Ritual and Kingship* shortly to be published by the Clarendon Press—such an undertaking could truly be very worthwhile.

S. G. F. Brandon

CHRISTIAN OBEDIENCE IN THE UNIVERSITY*

The sub-title of this book is 'Studies in the life of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland 1930-1950'. From this one might expect that it is a kind of souvenir book intended almost exclusively for past members of the S.C.M. and of little general interest. No impression could be more mistaken. It is, of course, of great interest to former S.C.M. members, but Professor McCaughey has succeeded in painting a portrait of two tumultuous decades of British life as it impinged upon the University and College world. Thousands of professional people aged 30-50 reading these lively pages will feel 'this is my story; it was through this tangle of events and opinions that I had to thread my way; this makes the pattern of my life clearer to me than it has ever been before'.

The S.C.M. is indeed in an unique position in British Christianity because of its inter-denominational position and because, working in that group of the community where all the diverse currents of thought in the modern world flow most strongly, it deliberately plunges in. No Christian group is less withdrawn. In doing this it makes many enemies and takes some hard knocks. But no Christian body can call on so many resources from so many quarters (as the standard of its major conferences shows); indeed it only survives in a denominationally conscious world by the sheer quality of its works; if that ever fails it will go under.

Davis McCaughey (now Professor of Biblical Studies at Ormond College, Melbourne) played a large part in the S.C.M. in the years 1930-50, but he has the gift of being able to stand back and (aided by a fine style of writing) put things in perspective. The sketch of the pre-war and war years against their international background, which occupies the first eighty pages is quite brilliant. With its wide international and ecumenical contacts through the World's Student Christian Federation, the S.C.M. was well placed to see through the follies of British foreign policy in the thirties, on the one hand, and quickly to appreciate the significance of the German Church struggle on the other. There is a moving account of the contacts kept by William Greer (then General Secretary, now Bishop of Manchester) with members of the movement in 'the dispersion', i.e. on active service during the war. The book then turns to the basis of the University as such, and explains how it has become necessary to become much more self-conscious about the University within, so to speak, the divine economy, and not just take it for granted. The vocation of professional people in industry and education is examined, and there is a penetrating analysis of the totally new situation which has called into question much of the traditional thought about foreign missions and the practice of the missionary societies.

There is much more in the book. Whatever he touches—whether he is assessing the strength and weakness of Biblical Theology or so-called Christian Sociology, or giving the outlines of a theology of the place of power in life, or bringing illuminating quotations from the prose and poetry of the period—there is nothing which does not illuminate the context of our Christian discipleship in 1958. I cannot be neutral about this book for I have myself played a part in much of what it deals with, and I owe more than I can ever repay to the S.C.M. But I feel sure that it will do for many readers of *The Modern Churchman* what it has done for me, clarify nearly all in my past that has led me to this hour, and I hope they will read it.

RONALD PRESTON

*By J. Davis McCaughey (S.C.M. Press, 1958; pp. 228. 25/- net).

BOOKS RECEIVED

In addition the following books have been received. Inclusion in this list does not mean that they will not be reviewed at a later date.

A Study in Ethical Theory, by D. M. Mackinnon. (A. & C. Black. 21/-.)

On the Christian Faith: Selections from John Colvin. (Liberal Arts Press, New York, 1958. 95 cents.)

The Scrolls and the New Testament, edited by K. Stendhal. (S.C.M. 35/-.)

Kierkegaard's 'Johannes Climacus', translated by T. H. Croxall. (A. & C. Black, 1958. 16/-.)

Whitehead's Metaphysics, by Ivor Leclerc. (Allen & Unwin, 1958. 21/-.)

The Meeting of Love and Knowledge, by M. d'Arcy, S.J. (Allen & Unwin, 1958. 12/6.)

Muhammad and the Islamic Tradition, by E. Dermengham (Longmans, 1958. 6/-.)

The State and the Church in a Free Society, by A. Victor Murray. (Cambridge University Press, 1958. 22/6.)

Royal Sacrament. The Preacher and his Message, by R. A. Ward (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1958. 12/6.)

On the Way, by Olive Wyon (S.C.M. 8/6.)

Church and Race in South Africa, edited by J. M. Paton (S.C.M. 8/6.)

The Living World of the Old Testament, by B. W. Anderson (Longmans. 30/-.)

The Bridge is Love, by H. A. de Boer (Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 15/-.)

The English Carol, by Erik Routley (Herbert Jenkins. 21/-.)

Early Sites of Christianity, Peter Baum. (Faber & Faber Ltd. 21/-.)

Fundamentals of the Faith, by J. E. L. Oulton (S.P.C.K. 12/6.)

On Christian Doctrine. St. Augustine. The Library of Liberal Arts. 95 cents.)

Sins of the Day. (Longmans & Co. Ltd. 4/6.)

Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, 1958. Nos. 1 & 2.

Anglican Theological Review, July 1958.

Five 'Isms of To-day, by Greville Norburn (M.C.U. 2/6.)

The Making of Luke-Acts, H. J. Cadbury. (S.P.C.K. 18/-.)

Christianity Among the Religions of the World, A. Toynbee (O.U.P. 8/6.)

The Rise and Fall of the Individual, W. R. Witcutt (S.P.C.K. 12/6.)

The Mass and the English Reformers, C. W. Dugmore (MacMillan & Co. 30/-.)

1959

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE

at THE FROEBEL INSTITUTE, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.15

Chairman: Professor S. G. F. Brandon

Hon. Secretary: The Lady Kathleen Oldfield, M.A., 10a Bardwell Road, Oxford

PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME AS FAR AS COMPLETED

Monday — August 31st

Conference Sermon

Tuesday — September 1st

9.30 Immortality and Christianity
Dr. W. C. Frend.

11.30 Immortality and Other Religions
Dr. E. G. Parinder.

8.0 The Popular Attitude to Death
Rev. J. D. Pearce-Higgins.

Wednesday — September 2nd

9.30 Immortality and Humanism
J. H. Thomas.

11.30 Immortality and the Scientific View of Man

8.0 Immortality and Ethics

Thursday — September 3rd

9.0 Immortality and Purpose
Dr. F. H. Cleobury.

11.30 Eschatology and its Validity To-day
Rev. C. O. Rhodes.

8.0 The Logic of Christian Eschatology and Some Alternative Theories

Friday — September 4th

9.30 The Relevance of the Christian Conception of God
Professor S. G. F. Brandon.

N.B.—Unfortunately we are forced to raise the fees this year. They will be £6 for clergy and assistant teachers and £6 10s. for laymen.